DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 435 EA 014 580

TITLE	Study of ESAA Funded Programs to Reduce Disproportionate Disciplinary Actions against Minority Students. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	J W K International Corp., Annandale, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Program Evaluation (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	JWK-TR-C-524
PUB DATE	26 Jan 81
CONTRACT	300-79-0698
NOTE	168p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Demonstration Programs; *Discipline; Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Minority Group Children; Program Evaluation; *Racial Discrimination; *Recordkeeping; Records (Forms); Reliability; Success; Tables (Data); Validity
IDENTIFIERS	Emergency School Aid Act 1972

ABSTRACT

To evaluate a program funded under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students, researchers selected 15 of the 78 school districts receiving such ESAA funding and examined the reliability and validity of district data on disciplinary actions, described the ESAA programs, assessed the programs' overall value, and identified the attributes of the more successful programs. Data were gathered through one-week site visits that included program observation, data and recordkeeping reviews, and interviews with 92 central office staffers and 199 school staff members. The 15 schools covered grade levels 5-12 and represented a variety of geographic regions, socioeconomic levels, enrollment patterns, and minority groups. Variables examined included the percentage of minority students and staff, residential location, disciplinary code, administrative methods, and staff development activities as well as ESAA programs' duration, conceptual models, facilities, staffing, and services. The researchers identified fifteen conclusions and made four recommendations, including defining disproportionate minority disciplinary actions, developing a national system for classifying and recording disciplinary actions and a model for eliminating disciplinary discrimination, and establishing requirements for federally funded disciplinary programs. Five appendices present a glossary, ESAA program data and descriptions, interview schedules, and sample discipline reporting forms. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215435

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 014 580

JWK INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

C-524

STUDY OF ESAA FUNDED PROGRAMS TO REDUCE DISPROPORTIONATE DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS

Technical Report

January 26, 1981

Contract No. 300-79-0698

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Program Evaluation

Submitted by:

JWK INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
7617 Little River Turnpike, Suite 800
Annandale, Virginia 22003
(703) 750-0500

This report was produced under Contract No. 300-79-0698
for the Office of Program Evaluation, Department of Education.
The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the positions,
policy or views of the Department of Education.

The survey was designed and directed by Dr. Elizabeth Haven
with the assistance of Sondra Cooney, Thomas Dial, Margaret
McMullen and Thomas Oliver. The final report was prepared
by Sondra Cooney.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Discipline in schools became a major area of concern during the decade of the seventies. Major studies and reports shattered traditional myths that all children in America attend schools that provide a safe and protected shelter for students. The traditional administrative actions of suspension and expulsion to punish disciplinary infractions were under scrutiny by the legal system and others concerned about educating all students to their fullest potential.

Background of the Study

In 1974, the Children's Defense Fund published a report, Children Out of School in America, that indicated traditional disciplinary actions were not only ineffective, but also were quite likely to be discriminatory. In 1977, an Office for Civil Rights report released national statistics which documented that a disproportionate number of minority students were being suspended from school. As a result of these and other studies, school systems were encouraged under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funding for Fiscal Year 1979 to include components in Basic Grant proposals to address reducing disproprotionate disciplinary actions against minority students. One hundred and four school systems included activities designed to address disciplinary problems in their applications; seventy-eight received some funding and fifteen were selected for an intensive study of ESAA funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were to:

- examine the reliability and validity of disciplinary data collected at the local level;
- describe a sample of 15 ESAA projects designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students; and
- assess the overall success of this ESAA program and to identify some of the attributes of the more successful projects.

Trained researchers interviewed administrators and school staff, reviewed disciplinary data and record-keeping systems, and observed ESAA programs in the selected districts. Results of the study are intended to give a preliminary assessment of the efficacy of ESAA disciplinary projects, to assist federal program officials in identifying areas in which technical assistance may be needed, and to provide to schools relevant information on methods of planning, designing, and implementing programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

Study Methodology

Selection of the 15 programs was based on five criteria: (1) program emphasis on reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students; (2) evidence of quantitative measures of disciplinary actions especially as they relate to minority students; (3) previous experience and/or success in implementing programs designed to reduce disciplinary actions; (4) regional geographic distribution of study sites; and (5) minority populations representing the five racial/ethnic categories identified by the Office for Civil Rights. Forty individual schools were selected for visitation and observation. School selection was made using the following procedures: (1) one school in each district was chosen by the district contact person, usually the ESAA project director; (2) one school in each district was selected at random from among the list of target schools (schools with ESAA disciplinary programs) with secondary students; and (3) in each of the eight districts with the highest number of non-target schools (schools without ESAA disciplinary programs), one non-target school was selected at random from those with secondary students.

The fifteen districts included in the study sample are located in every geographic area of the United States with the exception of the Rocky Mountains and the Northern Great Plains. They are located in communities which vary in residential patterns from rural to inner-city urban. Student populations of the districts ranged from a total of 3,700 to 49,000. The proportion of minority students to total student population ranged from over 50 percent to less than 20 percent. Minority student populations were predominantly Black, but in at least one district, Hispanic students were the dominant minority group. Another district had a minority enrollment consisting of Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Black students in approximately equal numbers.

The forty individual schools represented all grade levels from 5 through 12. School enrollments ranged from approximately 450 to 2,500 students. Minority student enrollment varied from over 50 percent of the total school enrollment to less than 20 percent.

Project information from the study sample, while not applicable to all programs, was gleaned from 291 interviews and observations in districts and schools representing different geographic areas, socio-economic levels, enrollment patterns, and minority groups.

Major Findings of the Study

When the reliability and validity of measures of the numbers of disciplinary actions against minority students were examined, major findings were:

- Measures of disciplinary actions required by the Office for Civil Rights are the only measures of disciplinary actions reported by all districts.

- Data on disciplinary actions that are affected by federal, state, and local programs are not kept in any uniform or systematic way.

- ESAA program data were more likely to be recorded and reported on standard forms with clearly defined procedures than were school disciplinary data.

- Disciplinary data reported to OCR were misrepresentative or inaccurate in more than half of the study districts.

- Indices of disproportion based on OCR data are likely to show less disparity in disciplinary actions against minority students than actually exists.

A range of seventeen different disciplinary actions were used in the 15 study sites. Disciplinary actions common to study sites were defined and administered differently among and within districts. Expulsion data were most likely to be reported accurately, while corporal punishment data were most likely to be under-reported when compared to other OCR measures of disciplinary actions. When repeated disciplinary actions against minority students are recorded and reported, disproportion increases, as does the duration of exclusion from the regular classroom.

Descriptions of ESAA programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students were organized by ten program factors: historical background of the program; organizational structure of the district, school, and program; financial support; program objectives and program planning process; program services and activities; student characteristics; staff characteristics; program use elements; and program materials.

Findings from the descriptive data indicate:

- Districts in which decision-making was decentralized showed greater variations in ESAA program operations from school to school.

- Public awareness of district discipline policy and due process procedures varied widely among and within study sites.

- Efforts to coordinate services effectively are inhibited by a lack of resource continuity and differing program eligibility requirements.

- Modifications made in ESAA projects or desired by school and project staff may reflect a lack of adequate planning.

- All ESAA projects provided direct service to students that included individual counseling.

- Pre-service or related in-service training on the project was provided for staff in 40 percent of the study sites.

- No district-wide procedures for referral to the project or delivery of services by the project existed in two-thirds of the study sites.

When the range of descriptive factors or characteristics of the projects were further analyzed to identify similarities, three relationships were found to be strongly correlated.

The type of administrative structure of the project and district seems to directly relate to the clarity and specificity of ESAA project objectives. Projects operating under a decentralized administrative structure are most likely to state project goals in general terms without specific indicators of achievement or behavior. Centralized administration and specific objectives are also related, although not as strongly.

A strong relationship exists between administrative structure and control of access to the ESAA project. In districts in which the ESAA project operates under a central administrative structure, school administrators control student access to the project. There seems to be no converse relationship.

Finally, in those ESAA projects that provide resource services and have no constant supervision responsibilities for students, control of student access to the services rests with the ESAA project staff.

In order to give a preliminary assessment of the overall success of the ESAA program and some of the attributes of the more successful projects, preliminary OCR data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were analyzed, ESAA program evaluation data were reviewed when available, and attributes or factors of successful programs identified through other research studies were compared to program elements perceived as successful in the 15 study projects.

- Three ESAA projects did document a reduction in disproportion for suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment in target schools.

- Three projects demonstrated at least 50 percent of selected attributes of successful educational programs identified through other research studies.

- The most successful ESAA projects in this study sample operated under a central administrative structure, stated project objectives clearly and precisely, and used a planning process that included needs assessment and broad participation.

Project evaluation data were generally unavailable since 10 of the 15 projects were new programs begun during the 1979-80 school year. All of the ESAA projects demonstrated more success in the implementation phase of program development than in the planning and evaluation phases. Length of program operation experience seemed to have no effect on project success.

Limitations of the Study

Validity of disciplinary statistics could not be tested in the usual way, namely, reconstructing data from original records. Requirements of the Family Rights and Privacy Act (1976) and time constraints of the research study prohibited access to individual student records. Validity was assessed through types of people responsible for keeping records, their training, characteristics within the local settings that affected accuracy, the procedures and forms used to collect and report data, and description of the errors detected.

Since 10 of the 15 districts were in the first year of project implementation, an assessment of the success or effectiveness of the projects was impossible because of incomplete objective program data and limited program operation experience. Reduced funding levels and project modifications in staffing patterns and school participation precluded an assessment based on monitoring the proposed work plan. Thus, subjective data from observations and interviews became the foundation for determining project success. Such assessment by trained observers is recognized as a valid and reliable research method.

Recommendations

- A nationally accepted method of reporting and classifying school disciplinary actions and the causes for such actions should be developed.

Efforts to assess problems in school discipline are hampered by the lack of a common and comprehensive system for the collection of data. OCR collects national data on suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, and assignment to special programs for the socially maladjusted. These data are based on the first incident for a student, and data on repeated actions and the duration of exclusion due to disciplinary actions are not collected. Other federal, state, and local efforts collect data on disciplinary actions that are defined differently depending on programmatic, political, or other considerations. To assure a reliable and valid data base, disciplinary terms and data elements must be clearly defined and consistent. Through the elimination of forms that require similar information but have different formats and definitions, the reliability, validity, and usefulness of the data collected would be increased without increasing the paperwork burden on schools and districts. A conceptual framework for the collection and use of disciplinary data at the federal, state, and local level that is mutually accepted would assist efforts to identify, diagnose, and treat problems in discipline and discrimination.

- A clear conception of what constitutes disproportionate disciplinary actions for minority students should be developed.

The present arrangement of assessing the impact of school discipline on minority students depends on questionable data, differing methods of analyzing that data, and differing conceptions of over-representation/disproportion. Variations in minority and non-minority disciplinary actions may be due to discrimination that pervades school systems or they may be due to conditions, policies, or management within certain schools. If the fundamental problem is discrimination, the causes are likely to be complex and not easily solved by adding a program to treat the symptoms. Agreement on what constitutes disproportion and identification of probable causes would help districts and schools determine where discrimination in discipline exists and what actions are needed to eliminate the causes of discrimination.

- To address the problem of discrimination in school discipline, a coherent model, based on the results of research and experience in human relations and successful educational initiatives, should be developed and disseminated.

Previous and on-going studies supported by ESAA have identified effective human relations, counseling, and parental involvement practices that result in positive changes in school climate for minority students. Recent research and the results of this study have identified and described planning, implementation, and evaluation factors critical to successful educational programs. A model should be developed that incorporates strategies most likely to be effective in eliminating discrimination in school discipline. Information on the model and technical assistance should be available to local and state agencies concerned with school discipline and its impact on minority students.

- Federal funding at the program level should be contingent upon comprehensive project planning and appropriate strategies based on model programs or exemplary practices for reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

The importance of the planning process to the success of educational programs has been well-documented in research studies. To assure effective use of funds, projects should be assisted and required to complete a specified planning process which would identify disciplinary needs and problems of schools, staff, and students. From information available on model programs and practices, appropriate strategies could be selected that would help schools reduce discrimination against minority students in disciplinary actions. This study was designed to be descriptive in nature. Further controlled evaluation would be necessary to identify effective model programs. The federal government has the resources to provide comprehensive program development assistance to solve critical national problems. Dissemination of information, research, technical assistance, and training to increase local program effectiveness would seem to be an appropriate use of federal resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
CHAPTER I:	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II:	BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	3
CHAPTER III:	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
CHAPTER IV:	STUDY METHODOLOGY	15
CHAPTER V:	AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF MEASURES OF THE NUMBERS OF DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS	29
CHAPTER VI:	A DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES OF ESAA PROJECTS DESIGNED TO COMBAT DISPROPORTIONATE DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS	45
CHAPTER VII:	A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE ESAA PROGRAM AND SOME OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE MORE SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS	67
CHAPTER VIII:	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	81
References		89
APPENDIX I:	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	93
APPENDIX II:	SOURCE TABLES	99
APPENDIX III:	STUDY METHODOLOGY	111
APPENDIX IV:	SAMPLE DISCIPLINE REPORTING FORMS	127
APPENDIX V:	PROGRAM ABSTRACTS AND SELECTED PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS	139

TABLES

		Page
TABLE 1:	COMPARISON OF THE 15 SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH THE 79 SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVING ESAA FUNDS FOR DISCIPLINE PROJECTS, FY 1979	17
TABLE 2:	CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN STUDY	21
TABLE 3:	A COMPARISON OF MINORITY STAFF AND MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN STUDY DISTRICTS.	22
TABLE 4:	CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN STUDY.	24
TABLE 5:	CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWEES IN STUDY GROUPED BY RACE AND SEX	25
TABLE 6:	TYPES OF STAFF INVOLVED IN RECORD-KEEPING.	26
TABLE 7:	A COMPARISON OF DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AVAILABLE NATIONALLY FOR ATTENDANCE OFFENSES AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AVAILABLE IN ESAA STUDY SITES	30
TABLE 8:	DISCIPLINARY OPTIONS AVAILABLE IN DISTRICTS IN SAMPLE STUDY	31
TABLE 9:	DISCIPLINE DATA ELEMENTS COLLECTED BY DISTRICTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE	38
TABLE 10:	DISCIPLINE DATA TABULATIONS PREPARED FOR DISTRICT USE	40
TABLE 11:	FREQUENCY OF PLANNING PROCESS VARIABLES IN SELECTED STUDY SITES	54
TABLE 12:	MODIFICATIONS MADE OR EXPECTED IN ESAA	55
TABLE 13:	SERVICES TO STUDENTS PROVIDED BY ESAA PROJECTS . . .	56
TABLE 14:	BEHAVIORAL MODELS USED BY ESAA PROJECTS FOR COUNSELING STUDENTS	57
TABLE 15:	SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED BY ESAA DISCIPLINE PROJECTS	58
TABLE 16:	MOST COMMON REASONS FOR STUDENT SERVICE.	59
TABLE 17:	CHARACTERISTICS PERCEIVED AS NEEDED FOR ESAA DISCIPLINARY PROJECTS.	61

Page

TABLE 18: VARIABLES PERCEIVED BY DISTRICT PERSONNEL AS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS 72

TABLE 19: VARIABLES PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL AS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS 73

TABLE 20: A COMPARISON OF ESAA PROJECTS BASED ON ATTRIBUTES OF SUCCESS 77

FIGURES

Figure 1: LIST OF RELEVANT ITEMS ON OCR FORMS AND WHERE THEY ARE COLLECTED 35

Figure 2: SELECTED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS 64

Figure 3: ATTRIBUTES OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS OBSERVED IN ESAA PROJECTS. 76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Discipline in schools became a major area of concern during the decade of the seventies. Major studies and reports shattered traditional myths that all children in America attend schools and that schools provide a safe and protected shelter for students. Public opinion polls and surveys of school personnel reinforced perceptions that discipline was a major problem in education. The traditional administrative actions of suspension and expulsion to punish disciplinary infractions were under scrutiny by the legal system and others concerned about educating all students to their fullest potential. National statistics released by the Office for Civil Rights indicated that a disproportionate number of minority students were being suspended from school. As the decade ended, many efforts to provide an alternative to suspension and explusion and to keep students in school had begun. Promising programs were being identified and the search to establish successful factors of alternative programs began.

School systems were encouraged under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funding for FY1979 to include components in Basic Grant proposals to address reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. One hundred and four school systems included a response to this initiative in their proposals; seventy-eight were funded and fifteen were selected for intensive study during the project that is the subject of this report.

The purpose of this study is to:

- examine the reliability and validity of disciplinary data collected at the local level;
- describe a sample of 15 ESAA projects designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students; and
- assess the overall success of this ESAA program and to identify some of the attributes of the more successful projects.

Trained researchers interviewed administrators and school staff, reviewed disciplinary data and record-keeping systems, and observed ESAA programs in the selected districts. Results of this study are intended to give a preliminary assessment of the efficacy of ESAA disciplinary projects, to assist federal program officials in identifying areas where technical assistance may be needed, and to provide information relevant to school systems' methods of planning, designing, and implementing programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

Chapter II provides a background for the study, and Chapter III reviews the relevant literature. The study methodology, including the approach to site selection, data collection procedures, and characteristics of the study sites, is detailed in Chapter IV. The objectives of the study are examined through a series of study questions, with presentation of the data and pertinent interpretations and findings included in Chapters V, VI, and VII. Conclusions and recommendations of the study are summarized in Chapter VIII.

Five appendices are attached to the report. Appendix I contains a glossary of terms used to describe disciplinary reporting and program services. Included in Appendix II are reference tables on which data reported for individual districts and schools are recorded. Appendix III provides copies of the study instrumentation, and Appendix IV has samples of disciplinary forms used by the sites. Appendix V contains abstracts of the 15 programs observed and selected site observations.

Data are presented in a way intended to ensure anonymity for individuals, schools, and districts. Program abstracts are included for the convenience of the reader and are organized alphabetically by project title.

This study would not have been possible without the cooperation of the staff of the 15 school districts and the 40 schools visited. The time spent in helping the researchers and the candor displayed in interviews greatly facilitated the research process. We gratefully acknowledge these individuals as partners in this effort to assess ESAA programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Legal Factors Affecting Discipline

Since the turn of the century, courts in the United States generally have ruled that the teacher stood in loco parentis and could thereby exercise in the classroom the same authority a parent would exercise at home. In essence, courts ruled that children's constitutional rights were replaced by the doctrine of in loco parentis in school.

The first successful breaches in this doctrine occurred in the 1960's, when civil libertarians moved their focus of attack from the state to the federal courts. This, in turn, changed the legal focus from the power and responsibility of school authorities to maintain the state-mandated function of public education to the specific constitutional rights of the individual student.

In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967, cited in Bolmeier, 1977), was the first major ruling. In it the Supreme Court said that before a juvenile may be found guilty and penalized for an offense s/he must be accorded the same due process rights as an adult. This was followed by Tinker vs. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969, cited in Bolmeier, 1977). In this ruling, the constitutional rights of students -- in this case First Amendment rights of free expression -- were upheld. The majority opinion read in part:

> Students in school as well as out of school are 'persons' under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the state must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the state ... [neither] students nor teachers shed their constitutional rights at the schoolhouse gate.

Specifically related to suspension of students from the regular education program was Goss vs. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975, cited in Bolmeier, 1977). This case stemmed from a racial incident in 1971 in Columbus, Ohio, which resulted in the suspension of nine students. At specific issue was the Ohio statute that authorized principals to suspend students for up to 10 days without notice or hearing. Writing for the majority, Justice Shite said that students facing temporary suspension from a public school have property and liberty interests that qualify them for protection under the due process clause of the 14th Amendment. Therefore, the court required that in connection with a suspension of 10 days or less, the student must be given oral or written notice of the charges against her or him. When and if the student denies the charges, s/he must be given an opportunity to present her/his side. Longer suspensions or expulsions, the opinion went on to state, may require more formal due process procedures.

The final case relevant to this particular subject is Wood vs. Strickland, 420 U.S. 308 (1975, cited in Bolmeier, 1977). Here the issue was dismissal of three girls for "spiking" the punch at a school party. The two significant findings of the Court were that the girls had not been accorded due process of law prior to their dismissal; and that school board members, as individuals, are not immune from liability for compensatory damages under the Civil Rights Act of 1871.

Both cases specifically related to suspension were decided 5 to 4. It is worth noting that the Court took pains not to leave the impression that it was removing school administrators' authority to maintain an orderly educational environment. Even while extending the First Amendment rights to students in the Tinker case, the Court said:

> The Court has repeatedly emphasized the need for affirming the comprehensive authority of the States and of school officials, consistent with fundamental constitutional safeguards, to prescribe and control conduct in the schools.

One year earlier, in 1968, the Court stated:

> By and large, public education in our Nation is committed to the control of state and local authorities. Courts do not and cannot intervene in the resolution of conflicts which arise in the daily operation of school systems and which do not directly and sharply implicate basic constitutional values. (Epperson vs. Arkansas, 89 S. Ct. 266, cited in Bolmeier, 1977).

Finally, in Wood vs. Strickland, Justice Byron White, even while ruling in part for the expelled students, wrote:

> It is not the role of the federal courts to set aside decisions of school administrators which the court may view as lacking a basis in wisdom or compassion. Public high school students do have substantive and procedural rights while at school. But Sec. 1983 (Civil Rights Act of 1871) does not extend the right to relitigate in federal court evidentiary questions arising in school disciplinary proceedings or the proper construction of school regulations. The system of public education that has evolved in this Nation relies necessarily upon the discretion and judgment of school administrators and school board members, and Sec. 1983 was not intended to be a vehicle for federal court correction of errors in the exercise of that discretion which do not rise to the level of violations of specific constitutional guarantees.

Students are, thus, guaranteed due process rights while at the same time school authorities have the right to maintain an orderly environment. If this means a student is not "suited," for whatever reason, to a regular class, some legal experts believe they may also be entitled to an alternative

class which is equivalent. McLung (1974) quotes several cases which suggest that:

> ... the child with behavior problems does not necessarily have a right to remain in a regular class, but rather that the school has a continuing responsibility to educate such children and must explore educational alternatives if the child is found to substantially disrupt regular classes.

Even when student rights are guaranteed and due process procedures are legally proper, exclusion from a regular classroom can still be challenged. McClung in "The Problem of Due Process Exclusion" (1975) claims that under equal protection analysis, the punishment must be reasonably related to the offense. Mendez (1977) contends that every disciplinary action should have a two-fold rationale; it should attempt to modify the student's behavior and protect others in school. The Guidelines for School Discipline (1976) of the Pennsylvania State Department of Education state that if the disciplinary response does not result in correcting the misbehavior, it should be discontinued. Severe responses to minor misbehavior are considered counter-productive.

Thus, at present, students who are extremely disruptive may be excluded from school provided due process is observed. There is no requirement that alternative programs be offered. Many schools have developed alternative programs to keep students in school, with and without federal support.

Legislation Affecting Discipline

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 200d, states that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability are required of all federal agencies disbursing assistance. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the Department of Education (formerly part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) is charged with collecting information on compliance with Title VI and investigating cases of noncompliance. In 1974, a report by the Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., Children Out of School in America, detailed research findings on children excluded from school. OCR data on school exclusions were analyzed in the research study. CDF concluded that the data were "woefully inadequate." OCR data do not include reasons for exclusion, frequency of exclusion (recidivism) or duration of exclusion. CDF found numerous errors in the data analyzed, and concluded that school exclusions were probably seriously under-reported.

When the 1972 Education Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were passed, they included a Title VII program to assist local education agencies in the process of eliminating or preventing minority group isolation and improving the quality of education for all children. The purpose of the title was:

> to provide financial assistance --
>
> (1) to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary school; and
>
> (2) to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.

To implement Title VII, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) was originally organized around eight sub-programs. With the passage of the Education Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-561), Title VII became Title VI. The purpose of the title remained the same, but the organization of programs to fulfill the purpose was restructured. The state apportionment program, the Basic Grant, provides assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) for authorized activities if they are directly related to, and necessary to, the implementation of an eligible desegregation plan. To be eligible, the desegregation plan must have been approved as adequate under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for the desegregation of minority group children or faculty in schools, or have been issued by a court of the United States, a court of any state, or any other State agency or official of competent jurisdiction.

Authorized activities may include: staff training; provision of additional staff; development or acquisition of new curricula, methods, or materials to support a program of instruction; innovative educational activities; community relation and public information efforts; planning, evaluation, dissemination, and other administrative activities necessary to the activities of the project; and provision of compensatory services to children who have received such services but who are no longer eligible as a result of attendance area changes under a desegregation plan.

Rationale for This Study

An analysis by OCR of the 1975 school desegregation survey showed that minority students were being kept out of school as a disciplinary measure more frequently than non-minority students. A 1977 OCR study identified numerous LEAs throughout the country as "having an over-representation of minority students involved in disciplinary actions" (Associate Commissioner, Equal Educational Opportunity Program, Note 1). Since disproportionate representation of one or more groups of children may be an indicator

of discrimination, analytical techniques are used to determine whether the disproportion is significant. As early as 1974, the Children's Defense Fund had urged OCR to establish statistical tests which could result in prima facie evidence of violation of Title VI in discipline measures. Suggested tests included use of statistical methods to determine whether an observed difference in any given sample is greater than that expected on the basis of mere chance or probability; percentages of minority students disciplined compared to all students disciplined in excess of a set standard varying between five and ten percent; school system tests that establish evidence of possible discrimination when 75 percent of the individual schools report disciplinary actions against minority students that exceed enrollment proportions by between 2 and 5 percent; an absence of legally accepted due process procedures where any excess of minority disciplinary actions are reported; and a variety of indices based on data indicating unequal levels of punishment, unequal kinds of offenses, and unequal duration of punishment which all together would constitute discrimination.

OCR uses data submitted by individual schools and LEAs on forms 101 and 102 of the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey as the base for reports of over-representation. Before targeting any school district for disproportionate representation, a test of significance is performed. If disciplinary actions are without regard to race or ethnicity, then the proportionate total of disciplinary actions for each race or ethnic group will be distributed with a mean equal to the proportion that the group represents of total school enrollment. The distribution is approximated by use of binomial distribution (sampling with replacement). The significance level is set at two standard deviations from the mean. For those districts identified by this test as having a significant disproportion of minorities receiving disciplinary actions, further analysis is performed. Districts are ranked relative to all other districts in the nation on the extent of the over-representation. Extent is determined by multiplying the numerical difference or number in excess and the percent in excess -- the excess divided by the number of pupils receiving a specific disciplinary action (Office for Civil Rights, Note 2).

Since one of the purposes of ESAA is "to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group ... discrimination among students ... in elementary and secondary schools"; disciplinary actions of schools and districts became an area of interest to the federal ESAA office. Steps were taken to explore why discrimination exists in disciplinary actions, and whether it is a problem that pervades whole school systems as opposed to certain schools within a system.

In 1978, school districts with ESAA Basic Grants were provided materials that described activities deemed successful in correcting problems of over-representation or disproportion of minority students involved in disciplinary actions which remove the student from the classroom. ESAA invited their grantees to include a component to address disproportionate

disciplinary actions against minority students in the Basic Grant application for FY 1979. After submission of the grant applications, ESAA identified 104 applications that contained activities designed to address disciplinary problems. Seventy-eight of the applications received some funding for a disciplinary program component within their Basic Grant. This study was initiated to investigate the experiences of LEAs in planning, implementing and evaluating activities designed to reduce over-representation/disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The federal and state governments have supported efforts to improve educational service to students who are disadvantaged, non-English speaking, pregnant, handicapped, minority, or in need of a non-traditional approach to education. But to receive the services of these special programs, students have to be in school. Thus, the children who might benefit from these efforts are often the same children who are excluded from school for disciplinary reasons. With increased emphasis on student rights and due process procedures through legal actions and rulings, schools began to accept a continuing responsibility to pupils even though there was no legal mandate for students excluded through disciplinary action. There are many kinds of disciplinary actions. (See Appendix I, Glossary of Terms.) Some, such as expulsion and suspension, exclude the student from the school completely. These actions are generally more easily recognized and have been more thoroughly researched. Recently, more attention has been focused on other disciplinary actions that exclude a student from the regular classroom but not necessarily from school. Declining enrollments and loss of financial aid due to student absence have fostered the development of these disciplinary alternatives to exclusion.

Purposes of Exclusion

A report by the Children's Defense Fund, Children Out of School in America (1974), found, by analyzing 1970 U.S. Bureau of the Census data, that nearly two million children, aged 7 to 17, were not enrolled in school. To investigate this finding, CDF conducted extensive structured interviews with parents and children in 8500 households in nine states and the District of Columbia between July 1973 and March 1975. Information submitted by school districts to the Office for Civil Rights as a part of the 1973 Civil Rights Survey of Elementary and Secondary Schools was also analyzed. CDF found use of school suspension rampant, especially for secondary school children and minority children. Eight percent of all secondary school children had been suspended at least once, and Black school children were suspended twice as much as White school children, three times as often at the secondary level.

CDF also found that, while suspension was the most common disciplinary device used to exclude children from school, a wide variety of other disciplinary actions with exclusionary impact had also been developed. "Voluntary" withdrawals, "temporary dismissals," cooling-off periods, etc., also excluded children from school, but were not reported as suspensions or expulsions.

Junious Williams, in his article, "In-School Alternatives to Suspension: Why Bother?" (1978) analyzed the practice of suspension in schools and found that schools generally use three types of school removals: short-term suspension, long-term suspension, and expulsion. Williams characterized

expulsion as the most severe disciplinary practice. An expulsion represents an official decision by a local board of education to deny a student attendance at any school operated under its jurisdiction. Suspensions, both short- and long-term, are distinguishable from expulsions through a specific time frame when readmittance or reinstatement is possible. Long-term suspensions generally remove a student from school for more than ten days, while short-term suspensions generally last from one to 10 days. Procedural protection associated with the suspension decision may also vary according to the length of time a student is removed from school.

CDF interviewed no one in its survey who contended that suspension helped children. Most school officials gave the principal purpose of suspension as "to get parents in." Williams presents the purposes of school removals from the school's point of view as:

(1) the protection of the physical safety of others in the school environment;

(2) to force students to comply with established behavioral rules that teach the bounds of conduct necessary in a society;

(3) to provide a cooling-off period for the student and the staff; and

(4) to get parents to come in for conferences.

Whether or not suspensions and expulsions serve these purposes is open to question. Schools do continue to rely on suspension as a treatment. Williams cites four major reasons for this reliance: (1) Suspension is convenient and takes little time and effort. An administrator has only to review facts, provide an informal hearing, decide the matter, notify parents by phone and follow-up letters, do paperwork and sometimes hold a readmission conference with parents; (2) Schools have a limited set of responses to minor misbehavior, such as corporal punishment, calling parents, detention, and talking to the student, and feel a need for something more; (3) Local efforts to make discipline practices standard and systematic may encourage the use of suspension because administrative discretion is limited by discipline codes; (4) School personnel believe that suspension works because it is a traditional method.

Reasons for Exclusion

In the survey conducted by the Children's Defense Fund, 63.4 percent of all suspensions were for offenses that were neither dangerous to persons nor property; 24.5 percent were related to truancy and tardiness; and 3 percent of the suspensions were for destruction of school property, criminal activity, or drug and alcohol use. The study concludes that in schools in very different places with very different student populations, the major reasons for suspension are absence, insubordination, or other minor

infractions of school rules which could have been dealt with in ways other than exclusion.

Based on the Project for the Fair Administration of Student Discipline survey of four Michigan school districts in 1974-75, Williams (1978) presents four categories of offenses that result in suspension. The information was gathered from letters sent to parents notifying them of suspensions. Attendance violations, law violations (such as drug offenses, possession of weapons), fighting, and discretionary offenses (such as insubordination) are listed. The conclusions bear a striking similarity to findings by CDF which were based on interviews with parents and suspended students. Attendance violations and discretionary offenses accounted for half the suspensions in the Michigan survey.

A random sample of members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) cited the most frequent reasons for suspensions, in rank order, as: attendance problems (truancy, skipping, repeated tardiness); smoking; nonviolent acts disruptive to the educational process (disrespect, defiance, misbehavior, class disruption, cheating); violations of other school rules (school bus, cafeteria); assault, fighting, or threat of injury; and drugs and alcohol, vandalism, theft, or other destruction of property (cited in AASP, 1979).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Critical Issues Report, Keeping Students In School (1979), found that truancy is now a top priority problem confronting the nation's schools. "More than half of the 1,414 AASA members who responded to the survey cited casual class cutting or casual cutting of the whole school day as a serious problem" (p. 11). Only 18 percent of the respondents said they had found effective answers.

Marion Wright Edelman, in presenting the CDF findings to the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in 1975 (cited in CDF, 1975), pointed out that perhaps the most sinister effect is that suspension tends to fall disproportionately on minority students, thus creating a whole class of "pushouts," especially among Black males. Black children were suspended at twice the rate of any other ethnic group. CDF also found that children receiving public assistance as their total or partial income were more likely to be suspended than were children in female-headed, single parent families.

Williams (1978) in his research revealed that not only are Black students more likely to be suspended, but they also are more likely to be referred for disciplinary action. Although the research evidence suggests that minority and majority students share an equal probability of being suspended when they are referred to an administrator, the disproportionate number of Black students referred results in the observable disproportion in suspensions.

Effects of Exclusion

The Children's Defense Fund concluded its report by severely criticizing the practice of suspension. CDF said:

> Suspensions (1) take away educational time that may cause marginal, weak or poorly motivated students to drop out permanently; (2) label children as "troublemakers" thereby making repeated behavior problems more likely; (3) deny children needed help; and (4) contribute to juvenile delinquency by putting unsupervised children and those with problems into the streets.

Williams also suggests that there are other immediate and long-term effects that affect students, schools, and communities directly and indirectly. Suspension can isolate students from a structure and peer support needed in their environment, while conveying personal feelings of rejection and frustration. Suspensions seen as arbitrary and discriminatory may offend student, parent, and community perceptions of justice and fairness. Suspension may also have a direct economic effect on schools through reduced state aid. While reduced state aid was ranked at the bottom of the list of negative results of poor student attendance in the AASA Critical Issues Survey, 14.4 percent of the respondents reported a specific annual dollar loss to schools for unexcused absences which totaled 71.4 million dollars.

Many of the facets of disciplinary practices have not been researched or addressed extensively in the literature. Parents and schools are considered equal partners in and equally responsible for the education of children, but the role of parents in school disciplinary actions has not been defined. The same is true of community agencies. Schools cannot or should not assume responsibility for satisfying all the complex needs of students. Services are available in many communities to provide social and personal support. The literature does not provide information on the development of a coordinated effort to use all community resources in addressing disciplinary problems.

The CDF study found that more minority than non-minority students were suspended more than once, and that almost one-fourth of all suspended students had been suspended three or more times. Yet recidivism in suspension or assignment to alternative programs has not been well documented or researched. Data required by the Office for Civil Rights does not include recidivism rates.

Legal actions and precedents have provided an impetus to school districts to specify and follow due process procedures for suspensions and expulsions. Little is known about the adherence to these procedures if students are assigned to some type of in-school alternative to exclusion.

Finally, little research has been done on whether attendance violations should be addressed separately and differently from victim-related offenses.

A report prepared for the Los Angeles City Board of Education (cited in AASA, 1979) did link violent crime on school campuses with absentee students.

Several states have focused efforts on documentation and program practices for truants (AASA, 1979). But interest in this area is recent and little data are available as yet.

Summary

This review of the literature indicates that the extant data on school disciplinary actions that result in exclusion may be misrepresentative. Furthermore, minority students may be disproportionately excluded and disproportionately harmed by exclusion for disciplinary offenses. Efforts to find disciplinary alternatives to exclusion have begun recently, but little is known about the success of these special projects.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY METHODOLOGY

To address the issue of disproportionate disciplinary actions, ESAA invited school systems to submit Basic Grant proposals with program elements that addressed disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students for funding during Fiscal Year 1979. A disciplinary action was defined as any action which removes a student from the regular classroom for disciplinary reasons. One hundred and four LEAs submitted proposed workplans for reducing the disproportion of minority disciplinary actions with their 1979-80 Basic Grant Proposals. Seventy-eight districts received some funding for a disciplinary program component within their Basic Grant applications.

Site Selection

To identify the fifteen districts required for the study of ESAA programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students, the 78 proposals funded were carefully read. Study design criteria for selection which corresponded to the three research objectives of the study were applied to this total group of proposals. These criteria were:

1. Program emphasis on reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. Special student concerns components had to include strategies beyond academic remediation. Such strategies could include human relations training, in-school suspension alternatives, additional counseling services, and multicultural awareness activities.

2. Evidence of quantitative measures of disciplinary actions, especially as they relate to minority students. Such data could include trend data, anecdotal references, and needs assessment measures.

3. Previous experience and/or success in implementing programs designed to reduce disciplinary actions. Such experience could provide a broader perspective of successful attributes and contribute to more comprehensive assessment designs in the future.

Twenty-three programs from the original 78 proposals qualified for inclusion in the study, based on these criteria.

A reduction in the number of participating districts to 15 was necessary because of limited funds and time constraints. Since the ESAA program is a national effort directed toward all minorities, two additional

criteria were used to reduce the number of study sites to fifteen. These two criteria assured inclusion of:

1. A regional, geographic distribution of study sites.

2. Minority group populations that include Hispanics, Asians or Pacific Islanders, and American Indians or Alaskan Natives in addition to Blacks.

Random samples were drawn and examined for appropriateness based on these two additional criteria. A comparison of the final sample of 15 to the 23 programs meeting the first three criteria is presented in Table 1.

The study design also required that at least 38 schools in the fifteen selected districts be visited. Since ESAA funding can be targeted to specific schools with special needs within districts, not every school in every district has a program designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. In consultation with the federal project staff, it was decided that 30 of the 38 schools were to be "target schools," that is, schools in which ESAA discipline programs were in operation. At least eight more schools were to be non-target schools, that is, schools that had no specific program for reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. The inclusion of non-target schools was designed to provide data on record-keeping activities and disciplinary procedures in schools with no specific ESAA discipline programs. An additional study design criterion required that all selected schools were to include "middle" and/or "upper" grade students. Since previous studies and data indicated that secondary minority students were three times more likely than non-minority students to be suspended or expelled, secondary school programs were deemed more likely to serve students "most in need." Grade level organization patterns vary widely across the nation. Thus, to ensure a complete representation of students in grades 7-12 (generally accepted definitions of secondary students), schools encompassing any of the grades from 5 through 12 were eligible for selection.

The following procedures were used to select individual schools in the 15 districts for visitation and observation.

1. One school in each district was chosen by the district contact person, in most districts, the ESAA project director.

2. One school in each district was selected at random from among the list of target schools meeting the grade level requirements.

3. In each of the eight districts with the highest number of non-target schools, one non-target school was selected at random from the list of non-target schools meeting the grade level requirement.

Table 1: COMPARISON OF THE 15 SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH THE 79 SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVING ESAA FUNDS FOR DISCIPLINE PROJECTS, FY 1979

Variable	Total Group (N = 23)		Sample (N = 15)	
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION				
Northeast	2	9%	2	13%
Southeast	14	61	9	60
Mid-West	2	9	1	7
Northwest	3	13	1	7
Far-West	2	9	2	13
Avg. % minority population[1]		41%		38%
No. with first-year programs	17	74%	10	67%
No. with minorities other than blacks	4	17%	4	27%
No. in "top 100" school districts[2]	13	57%	6	40%

[1] Based on OCR preliminary disciplinary action data, Fall 1979.

[2] The 100 districts in the nation that most appear to warrant investigation for discrimination in overpresenting minorities in suspension (OCR).

The element of choice was included in the school selection procedures to encourage district participation and cooperation and to identify those schools which were perceived by district staff as "successful" in implementing ESAA discipline projects.

The final sample included 40 schools, 33 target and 7 non-target. One non-target school was eliminated by district request. Two additional schools were added by district request. Both of the schools, while technically eligible since they served fifth grade students, were primarily schools serving elementary students.

Data Collection

The initial contact for the study was made with Chief State School Officers through a letter describing the effort and identifying the school districts selected in their states for this endeavor. This letter was signed by the Associate Commissioner for Equal Educational Opportunity Programs and the Assistant Commissioner for Evaluation and Dissemination. (Copies of these letters are included in Appendix II.) Clearance was obtained from the Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems (CEIS).

Local superintendents were later contacted, and a time schedule for each site visit was established with the people designated to assist in this research. Each contact person received: a brief description of the project, a list of the preview materials requested prior to the site visits, and a brief resume of the person who would be visiting the district. A list of the preview materials requested from the district, the project summary, and sample site visit schedules appear in Appendix III.

Observers spent a week in each school district. Project staff interviewed the following district staff members: (1) ESAA Administrator, Manager or Director; (2) school principals; (3) school disciplinarians; (4) staff in both district and school offices responsible for disciplinary record-keeping; and (5) selected ESAA discipline project staff. In several instances, the observers spoke with other minority and non-minority staff, parents, and students associated in some way with the project.

Discussions with identified school staff members and program observations are the basis for the data in this study. The usefulness of discussions for this purpose far exceeds that of a structured or questionnaire format, but ethnographic research must be carefully monitored or the information may not be useful or appropriate.

To insure sensitivity of interviewers, two days were spent in training the five professionals who would be collecting the data. One day was spent with the project director in general orientation, the second day with a consultant who had special expertise in this area. She also was recently involved with a federal project on in-school suspension programs and was familiar with the subject matter to be covered.

The training period emphasized the skills of listening, observing, questioning, note-taking, and reporting. Probing techniques, interpersonal skill development and unobtrusive measurement strategies were modeled to assist observers in the data gathering process.

Since the unstructured interview can easily lead observers in unanticipated directions, a monitoring device was built into the discussion flow. Several major content areas and sub-areas were proposed for guiding the interview. These are: staff (characteristics), school discipline (policy and statistics), record-keeping (forms and system), climate (school and community racial environment), and the ESAA program. The sub-topics within these areas are listed on Form E (Appendix III). Lines preceding these items establish high priority topics of discussion. The letter "D" preceding any line indicates that written materials should be obtained if available. This list is not all inclusive, nor did it restrict the content of the discussions with school staff members. In fact, the background, experience, and interest of the school staff and the interpersonal skills of the observers affected the emphasis in these conversations.

Staff selected to conduct the site visits were carefully chosen. Interviewers were required to have teaching and/or administrative experience in public education, experience in program research, development, and/or evaluation, and an advanced degree in a related social science area. Brief resumes of the interviewers used during the site visits are included in Appendix III.

Data Analysis

The analysis for this study is based on information that was obtained from the interviews described above and the records collected from the districts. To report comparable data, the observers completed comprehensive case studies of each site visited immediately following the site observation. Each case study was developed through a standard, comprehensive outline (Appendix IV). The case studies not only assured comparable data, but they also provided a richness of detail and an anecdotal record of program observation necessary for an assessment of successful program attributes.

In addition, these five observers developed a comprehensive check list of conditions, activities, and other variables which they observed in their field research. The variables included program model, conceptual model, facility model, staffing model, and direct and supportive services provided. Some of the descriptors were specific items; some were staff and program characteristics; some were attributes inherent in the school settings. Obviously, not all applied in any one system. Each researcher then checked, for each program observed, the items that they perceived as successful in the overall local effort to reduce minority suspensions.

Within a program, some elements are successful and some are not. Some may work in one area and not in another for a variety of reasons. No attempt is made in this study to do more than report on the perceptions

of the interviewers and those interviewed. However, judgmental ratings by trained observers can reflect a consistent pattern of what seems to work and what does not work. Results of other research studies on program implementation confirm the reliability of using trained observers to assess program effectiveness.

Validity of the discipline statistics could not be tested in the usual way, namely, reconstructing data from original records. Requirements of the Family Rights and Privacy Act (1976) and time constraints of the research study prevented access to individual student records. Validity was assessed by reviewing types and training of people responsible for keeping records, characteristics within the local settings which affected accuracy, the procedures and forms used to collect and report data, and description of the errors detected.

Characteristics of the Sample

With the exception of the Rocky Mountains and the Northern Great Plains, all geographic areas are represented by the school districts in this study. The majority, however, are located in the eastern half of the continental United States, where most of the ESAA projects are located.

As Table 2 shows, school districts are located in communities which range from those commonly described as rural to inner-city. The economic base for school funding ranges from agriculture to heavy industry. Educational jurisdictions encompass counties, cities, and combinations of municipal authorities. The student populations served are as small as 3,700 to as large as 49,000. In 1977, 54 percent of the nation's school districts (NCES, 1979) enrolled less than 10,000 students; in this study, 40 percent fell into this category.

Concerning minorities, Table 2 shows that no district has a student minority population of less than 20 percent. On the other hand, five districts have more than half of their enrollment belonging to minority groups. Minority staffing in seven of the 15 districts is less than 20 percent.

The disparity between minority students and minority staff is shown in Table 3. In 13 of the 15 districts, the proportion of minority students exceeds that of minority staffs, and seven show a disparity of 20 percent or more. Only one district has more than a 40 percent difference.

School populations of the districts visited are either predominantly Black or predominantly White. Hispanic enrollment exceeds that of Black minority students in only one district. Ten districts report Hispanic student populations of approximately 10 percent or less. In one district, minorities of the Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander communities approximate the size of the Black student enrollment. The largest percentage of Native Americans reported by any district is less than two percent.

Table 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN STUDY

Characteristics	No. of Districts (N=15)	Percent of Total
RESIDENTIAL		
Rural	4	27%
Suburban	2	13
Urban	3	20
Urban and Suburban	3	20
Suburban and Rural	2	13
Urban, Suburban and Rural	1	7
STUDENT ENROLLMENT		
40,000 or more	2	13%
20,000 to 39,999	3	20
10,000 to 19,999	4	27
5,000 to 9,999	5	33
Under 5,000	1	7
PERCENT MINORITY STAFF		
40 to 49%	1	7%
30 to 39%	3	20
20 to 29%	4	27
Less than 20%	7	47
PERCENT MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT		
50% or more	5	33%
40 to 49	1	7
30 to 39	5	33
20 to 29	4	27

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF MINORITY STAFF AND MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN STUDY DISTRICTS

CHARACTERISTICS	DISTRICT (N=15)																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
PERCENT MINORITY STAFF																	
50% or more																0	0%
40 to 49%	X															1	7
30 to 39%							X	X							X	3	20
20 to 29%									X		X	X	X			4	26
Less than 20%		X	X	X	X	X				X				X		7	47
PERCENT MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT																	
50% or more	X						X			X	X				X	5	33
40 to 49%						X										1	7
30 to 39%		X			X							X	X	X		5	33
20 to 29%			X	X				X	X							4	26
Less than 20%																0	0
PERCENTAGE OF DISPARITY																	
50% or more																0	0
40 to 49%										X						1	7
30 to 39%						X					X					2	13
20 to 29%					X		X							X	X	4	26
Less than 20%	X	X	X	X				X	X			X	X			8	53

NOTE: Percents may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Individual Schools

Thirty-three of the 40 schools visited had ESAA-funded programs designed to reduce disproportionate minority suspensions. These are referred to as target schools. As previously noted, seven non-target schools were also observed for purposes of achieving a more comprehensive appraisal and understanding of discipline procedures and record-keeping.

The majority of the schools visited were middle and secondary schools. However, in a few instances, where local staff felt that a program at lower grade levels was especially effective, such schools were also observed. The data show that 38 percent of the schools included grade seven and 40 percent grade eight. At the upper levels, 60 percent of the schools visited enrolled students in grades 9 and 10. Forty percent of the schools had a ninth through twelfth grade organizational pattern. (See Source Tables, Appendix II.)

Just as Table 2 summarizes selected characteristics of school districts, Table 4 presents an overview of similar-type characteristics for the schools visited. School enrollments range from around 450 to about 2,500 students with half of the schools enrolling 1,000 or more students.

In five target schools and three non-target schools, 20 percent of the schools included in this study, minority enrollment is 50 percent or more (Table 4): four of these schools have 40 percent or more minority staff, and four have less than 20 percent of their positions staffed with minorities. Only one of the eight schools has a minority staff of 50 percent or more.

A comparison of the percentages of minority students enrolled with the percentages of minority staff in the same schools shows that the proportion of minority students exceeds that of minority staffs in 78 percent of the schools visited: 26 of the 33 target schools and 5 of the non-target schools. In three non-target and two target schools, the percentage of minority student enrollment exceeds that of staff by at least 40 percent. Two schools in the study, one target and one non-target, have a higher ratio of minority staff than students. In 21 of the 40 schools, an approximate difference of 10 percent or less exists between the percentages of minority staff and student enrollment.

Staff Interviewed

Two hundred ninety one individuals participated in discussions with project staff: 92 central office staff and 199 school staff (Table 5). The data show that 89 (31 percent) are minorities and that ESAA project administration is the only job category in which minorities outnumber non-minority staff. Of the ESAA discipline program staff interviewed, 65 percent are women and 37 percent are minorities.

Since one of the objectives in this research is to assess discipline data collection procedures at both the district and school levels, interviewing personnel assigned record-keeping responsibility was crucial to the study.

Table 4: CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN STUDY

Characteristics	No. of Schools (N=40)	Percent of Total
STUDENT ENROLLMENT		
1500 or more	8	20%
1250 to 1499	6	15
1000 to 1249	6	15
750 to 999	10	25
500 to 749	7	18
Under 500	3	7
PERCENT MINORITY STAFF		
50% or more	1	2%
40 to 49	5	13
30 to 39	3	7
20 to 29	12	30
Less than 20%	19	48
PERCENT MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT		
50% or more	8	20%
40 to 49	9	23
30 to 39	16	40
20 to 29	3	7
Less than 20%	4	10

Table 5: CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWEES IN STUDY GROUPED BY RACE AND SEX

Classification	Minority		Non-Minority		Totals	Percent of Total
	Men	Women	Men	Women		
CENTRAL OFFICE						
ESAA Program Administrator	2	7	5	3	17	6
Other central office staff	9	7	42	17	75	26
TARGET SCHOOLS						
Principals	8	-	23	5	36	12
Disciplinarians	12	2	23	6	43	15
Program Staff	5	13	12	19	49	17
Others[1]	3	16	10	20	49	17
NON-TARGET SCHOOLS						
Principals	2	-	3	1	6	2
Disciplinarians	1	-	7	1	9	3
Others[1]	-	2	2	3	7	2
Totals	42	47	127	75	291	100
Percent of Total	14	16	44	26	100	

[1] Includes students, parent, and persons other than those listed above.

As Table 6 shows, 143 professional, technical and support staff (49 percent of the total interviewed) were involved in some way with this responsibility. Some were in charge of managing the system with responsibility for preparing the data collection forms. Others were suppliers of data such as teachers in charge of in-school suspension programs. Still others -clerks and typists -- grouped, copied, and/or typed statistics for regular discipline reporting. Many of the 143 provided other information to the observers.

Table 6: TYPES OF STAFF INVOLVED IN RECORD-KEEPING

Type of Staff		Number	Percent of Total
CENTRAL OFFICE			
ESAA Director		13	9%
Other professional staff (certificated)		17	12
Technical staff		4	3
Support Staff		16	11
SCHOOL STAFF			
Principals		13	9
Disciplinarians/deans		33	23
ESAA program staff:	Professional	25	17
	Support	9	6
Other staff:	Professional	--	--
	Support	13	9
Total Professional/Technical Staff		105	73%
Total Support Staff		38	27
	Totals	143	100%

Limitations of the Study

The descriptive nature of this study emphasizes the "what is" or state-of-the-art in addressing the problem of over-representation of minority students involved in disciplinary actions in schools. The more fundamental issues of what constitutes disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students and the causal factors of discrimination in discipline are not addressed. The complexities of disproportionate discipline, such as differences in rates of delinquency for different socio-economic groups and differences in purpose and composition among various types of secondary schools, i.e., academic, vocational, etc., are important factors to be considered before any national policy decisions are made as to "what should be." The data collected in this study are but first steps in the diagnosis of the problem of discrimination in school discipline.

Summary

The fifteen districts included in the study sample are located in every geographic area of the United States with the exception of the Rocky Mountains and Northern Great Plains. They are located in communities which

vary in residential patterns from rural to inner-city urban. Student populations of the districts ranged from a total of 3,700 to 49,000. The proportion of minority student to total student population ranged from over 50 percent to less than 20 percent. Minority student populations were predominantly Black, but in at least one district, Hispanic students were the dominant minority group. Another district had a minority enrollment consisting of Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Black students in approximately equal numbers.

The forty individual schools represented all grade levels from 5 through 12. School enrollments ranged from approximately 450 to 2,500 students. Minority student enrollment varied from over 50 percent of the total school enrollment to less than 20 percent.

Project information from the study sample, while not applicable to all programs, was gleaned from districts and schools representing different geographic areas, socio-economic levels, enrollment patterns, and minority groups.

CHAPTER V

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF MEASURES OF THE NUMBERS OF DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS

A series of study questions were designed to analyze data pertaining to the reliability and validity of measures of the numbers of disciplinary actions against minority students. Within this chapter, each study question will be identified and pertinent findings will be presented and discussed.

How are disciplinary actions defined?

Findings

- A range of seventeen different disciplinary actions were found in the 15 study sites.
- Disciplinary actions common to study sites were defined and administered differently from district to district.
- Differences in the definition and administration of disciplinary actions exist within districts from school to school.
- Districts with a written discipline policy that prescribes specific actions for specific offenses exhibit fewer differences in the definition and administration of disciplinary actions from school to school.
- Schools without in-school disciplinary programs tend to define more offenses as subject to suspension.

Table 7 compares the prevalence of disciplinary actions for attendance offenses reported by the AASA Critical Issues Survey to the districts selected for this study. Disciplinary actions used more frequently by schools in the ESAA study sample included parental contact, alternative placement options, and school exclusions. Data on legal actions instituted for disciplinary reasons were not collected in the ESAA study sample. All of the districts visited were governed by state school codes which provided legal remedies for truancy; yet very few districts considered legal action a viable disciplinary action. Several districts cited the length of time between referral and action to be so long as to render the action ineffective. Some districts reported that the legal action taken in their states was always a return to school on probation, while others cited the overcrowding and deplorable conditions of state juvenile facilities as inappropriate treatment for students with attendance problems.

Table 8 presents the range of disciplinary actions found in the 15 selected districts. All districts used at least 50 percent of the disciplinary actions identified in the study sample. One-half of the disciplinary actions involved out-of-school (removal from the regular classsroom) placement. Short-term suspension (usually 1-10 days) and expulsion were the out-of-school placements used most frequently.

TABLE 7

A COMPARISON OF
DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AVAILABLE NATIONALLY FOR ATTENDANCE
OFFENSES AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS
AVAILABLE IN ESAA STUDY SITES

DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS	AASA STUDY* SAMPLE % (N = 1414)	ESAA STUDY SAMPLE % (N = 15)
Phone call to parent	90%	100%
One-to-one counseling	87	87
Letter seeking parent intervention	70	100
Legal action	67	(not collected)
Suspension and expulsion	60	
short-term suspension		100
long-term suspension		67
expulsion		93
Home visit	58	53
Placement in alternative classroom	38	93
other learning center		46
Reduction of course grade	26	(not collected)
Other	13	
detention		80
parent conference		100

* Data obtained from AASA CRITICAL ISSUES SURVEY: KEEPING CHILDREN IN SCHOOL.

TABLE 3

DISCIPLINARY OPTIONS AVAILABLE IN DISTRICTS IN SAMPLE STUDY

OPTION	DISTRICT 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	X	% of Total
Student Conference	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100%
Parent Conference	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100
Short-Term Suspension*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100
In-School Alternative To Suspension	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	14	93
Expulsion*	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	14	93
Corporal Punishment	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	13	87
Counseling	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	12	80
Detention		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	12	80
Long-Term Suspension*	X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10	67
Alternative School (Other Program)*		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X			9	60
Home Dismissal*				X		X	X	X	X		X				X	7	47
Administrative (Lateral) Transfer*		X	X			X	X			X	X		X			7	47
Alternative School (Discipline Only)*		X	X		X	X	X		X	X						7	47
Work Detail	X			X		X					X	X				5	33
Behavioral Probation[2]				X	X					X						3	20
Detention Center[3]*											X					1	7
N=16	9	11	10	11	12	11	13	10	10	11	14	9	10	8	10		
Percent of Total	56	69	63	69	75	69	81	63	63	69	88	56	63	50	63		

NOTE: An asterisk indicates an option that involves out-of-school placement.

1 Dismissed temporarily until parents come to the school.

2 Denied participation in extra-curricular activities and required to report to a specified staff member who monitors the student's behavior.

3 Central building where students are detained and tutored while a hearing is pending.

There was also a range of definitions and applications within each disciplinary option among the 15 districts.

Expulsion was considered by all districts in the study to be the most severe disciplinary action available to school systems. Expulsion required formal adminstrative approval by the local governing body of the system. Usually Board of Education due process procedures, including written notice, a formal hearing, and the right of representation for the student were specified. Twelve of the 15 districts also provided for appeals.

Suspension is defined on the OCR forms as removal from school for a minimum of one day. In 13 of the 15 districts visited, suspension was differentiated from expulsion by the length of the removal from school. Six of the districts defined a short-term or temporary suspension as removal up to a maximum of 10 days. Two districts specified a long-term suspension as removal for more than 10 days, but one district considered removal for more than 5 days a long-term suspension. Indefinite suspension, defined as removal pending an expulsion recommendation and hearing, was designated as a disciplinary action in two districts. Two districts also used a home suspension or disciplinary dismissal of no more than one day as a disciplinary action. The length of this suspension depended on the arrangement of a parental conference. One district defined suspenion both by the duration of removal and the person requesting the suspension. Thus, a teacher suspension was a maximum of two days, a school (principal) suspension was a maximum of three days, and a discipline committee suspension was a maximum of 10 days. Two districts used only one type of suspension, which was for a maximum of either five or 10 days.

Voluntary withdrawal was not defined as a disciplinary action in any district visited. Yet, administrators in all disticts reported that students threatened with expulsion were often encouraged to "voluntarily" leave school before formal administrative action occurred. Voluntary withdrawal was advantageous for both student and parent(s), since that procedure simplifed readmittance to school. If no formal action to expel was taken by a Board of Education no formal action by the Board was necessary for readmittance for the next school term or year. In districts where expulsion was never or rarely used, voluntary withdrawal from a student's home school and transfer to another school was often encouraged and facilitated. Such transfers were most often found in large districts with many schools at each grade level.

Corporal punishment was a disciplinary action available in 13 of the 15 districts visited. Six of the districts allowed teachers to administer the punishment, while seven of the districts restricted the use of corporal punishment to principals or designees of the principal. All districts required a witness to the punishment and removal of the student from the classroom to a private space, usually an administrative office, for the administration of the punishment. Some districts specified the length, width, and weight of the paddle to be used.

Assignment to a district or school disciplinary program as an alternative to suspension was available in 14 of 15 of the study sites. In four of the districts with assignment options, such assignment was always at the discretion of the principal or a designee. Five of the districts followed a combination of specific guidelines for alternative assignment to the regular classroom and discretionary authority. The remaining five districts did not permit discretionary assignments by principals or designees. Automatic penalties or assignment for specific offenses were the most common guidelines. For example, fighting resulted in an automatic suspension in five districts, while a specified number of "tardies" resulted in an alternative assignment to an in-school suspension facility. Two districts that had allowed administrative transfers to programs outside the home school prior to 1979 rescinded such authority since involuntary transfer was judged to be a denial of due process.

An administrative warning, generally consisting of a verbal reprimand with no removal from the regular classroom, was available as a disciplinary action in all 15 sites. However, in three districts, the warning was expanded to behavioral probation which denied the student attendance at extra-curricular activities such as sports, arts, or club activities.

Referral to an administrator was a disciplinary action that was made available to all staff in all districts visited. Referrals are not generally considered to be exclusionary actions. However, depending upon the administrative organization and efficiency of the school, referrals can result in removal from the regular classroom. The duration of such removal may be from one period to a full day. In three of the sites observed, administrative offices were crowded with students who had been referred for disciplinary reasons. Observers noted students waiting to see an administrator for periods of two hours or more.

Variations of Disciplinary Actions

Among districts in the study, variations do exist in the definition of disciplinary actions. Variations which occur generally involve duration or due process requirements. Expulsion varies from twelve or eighteen weeks to a school year of 36 weeks. All districts require formal Board of Education action for expulsion and adhere to the due process procedures of notification, hearing, and the right to representation. Three of the 15 districts have no formal appeals process.

Suspension varies widely across the study districts. The maximum number of days a student may be suspended ranges from 5 days to 30 days. Reasons for suspension also differ. Possession of a weapon or a physical assault on a member of a school staff will result in immediate suspension in all sites studied. Beyond those two offenses, however, vastly different disciplinary actions may occur for the same offense. Smoking may result in suspension in at least a third of the districts visited, yet in at least two of the other districts, special areas have been set aside for student smoking. While 13 of the 15 districts did conform to a definition of

suspension as removal from school for at least one day, the other two districts defined removal from school for only one day as an absence rather than a suspension.

Variations in corporal punishment centered around student and parent acceptance of its use as a disciplinary action. Some districts allowed students and parents to refuse corporal punishment as a disciplinary action through written notification; other districts allowed the student a choice between corporal punishment or an alternative disciplinary action such as detention or suspension. In at least three districts, the use of corporal punishment required an administrative decision.

Assignment to an in-school alternative program also varied widely with respect both to the duration of the program and the reasons for assignment. Fourteen of fifteen schools notified parents in writing of the assignment. Assignments ranged from one period of one day to a maximum of 10 full days. Reasons were as varied as disrespect to a teacher, i.e., "He looked at me wrong," to possession of a controlled substance.

Definitions of disciplinary actions sometimes vary from school to school within districts. Generally it was found that the districts with written policy that prescribed specific actions for specific offenses had less variation among schools in both the definition and the application of disciplinary actions. In contrast, in districts in which individual school autonomy was strong and disciplinary authority by policy was discretionary, the types of disciplinary actions and their definitions were vastly different. For example, in one district school "A" had no suspensions for habitual tardiness. School "B" issued 490 suspensions for habitual tardiness. The administrator of the second school believed tardiness was a significant offense, requiring suspension, whereas the administrator in the first school believed tardiness required other remedies such as parent conferences and school disciplinary programs to alleviate the problem. Wide variations among schools were also noted in the seven districts where non-target schools were visited. The lack of a school disciplinary program seemed to increase the types of offenses defined as appropriate for suspension.

What disciplinary actions are being reported and measured in the 15 study sites?

Finding

- The only measures of disciplinary actions commonly reported by all districts in the study were those required on Office for Civil Rights forms 101, 102, 531, and 532.

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) maintains a national data base which is updated through information supplied by districts on Forms 101 and 532-1 and by individual schools on Forms 102 and 532-2. All ESAA applicants are required to submit all four forms, thus the 15 study sites collected and reported data on suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, and enrollment in programs for the socially maladjusted. A list of the relevant items for purposes of this study appears in Figure 1.

Figure 1

LIST OF RELEVANT ITEMS ON OCR FORMS AND WHERE THEY ARE COLLECTED

Items by Racial/Ethnic Groups	DISTRICT LEVEL Date	DISTRICT LEVEL OCR Form	INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL LEVEL Date	INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL LEVEL OCR Form
1. No. of pupils (membership)	—	—	Oct. 1976, Oct. 1978 Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	102 532-2
2. No. of pupils receiving corporal punishment	—	—	1975-76, 1977-78 1976-77, 1978-79	102 532-2
3. No. of pupils suspended[1]	—	—	1975-76, 1977-78 1976-77, 1978-79	102 532-2
4. No. of days suspended (in intervals) for one-time offenders	—	—	1976-77	532-2
5. No. of pupils expelled[2]	1975-76, 1977-78	101	1975-76	102
6. No. of students referred for disciplinary actions to juvenile court	—	—	1976-77	532-2
7. No. of students referred to alternate education programs as formal disciplinary measure	—	—	1976-77	532-2
8. No. of pupils in program for socially maladjusted	—	—	Oct. 1978 Oct. 1979	102 532-2
9. No. of pupils in specific special education programs, i.e.[3] a. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed b. Specific Learning Disability	—	—	Oct. 1976, Oct. 1978 Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	102 532-2
10. No of principals, teachers and head coaches[4]	Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	532-1	—	—
11. No. of pupils in compensatory or remedial instruction	—	—	1977-78, 1979-80	532-2
12. Grades Included[5]	—	—	1977-78, 1979-80	532-2

---

1 Suspension data are also available for 1972-1973 and 1973-74.

2 Expulsion data are available for all preceding years extending as far back as 1970-71.

3 These are special education programs which could be checked to see if they are used for severe discipline cases.

4 On OCR Form 532-1, these numbers are also reported by ethnic group for the year preceding the implementation of desegregation.

5 Grade Structure should be checked against suspicious changes in disproportionality.

Note 1: OCR Forms 101 and 102 were filled out in Fall 1976 and 1978; OCR Forms 532-1 and 532-2 were filled out in Fall 1977 and 1979.

Note 2: Forms 101 and 102 are sent to all ESAA applicants, to statistically-selected samples of school districts with specific characteristics and to districts operating under court order to desegregate. The number of districts within a state obviously varies. In some states, like Florida, all districts are eligible for the sample. The sample changes depend on the criteria used. All schools within a sample district must complete Form 102. OCR Forms 532-1 and 532-2 are mailed to all ESAA applicants - between 600 and 700 school districts.

In addition to the required OCR data, ESAA staff in districts and schools collect and report other disciplinary data such as assignments to in-school disciplinary programs, counseling sessions, and voluntary withdrawals. Since ESAA includes any action that removes a student from the regular classroom for disciplinary reasons in its definition of a disciplinary action, other actions such as detention, administrative referral, and home dismissal may be included in disciplinary reporting. None of these measures were reported at the district level in the 15 sites visited, although records of such actions were kept by some individual schools.

What data elements are used by districts in reporting discipline?

Findings

- Data elements used to collect and report disciplinary statistics vary widely among the 15 study sites.
- Racial/ethnic data elements ranged from five categories to two.
- Data on reasons for disciplinary actions ranged from two categories to more than twenty.

Racial/Ethnic Group

All of the districts visited were required, at the very least, to report suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment by the five racial/ethnic categories included on Office for Civil Rights forms. The data elements used to collect this basic data varied widely. Only two of the 15 sites used the five categories of Native American or Alaskan Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Hispanic; Black and White. One district omitted Native American or Alaskan Native; one district used only three categories, omitting Native American or Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander; ten districts used only two categories, either Black and White or Minority and non-Minority; and one district did not collect racial/ethnic data. Each principal in that district was expected to complete the forms accurately, however.

Unduplicated Counts

OCR forms also require that pupils who were suspended, expelled, or who received corporal punishment be counted once only. All district personnel in the 15 sites were aware of this definition, but confusion did exist among school personnel in at least eight of the fifteen districts visited. The substitution of total numbers of disciplinary actions for the number of students experiencing such actions was the most frequent misunderstanding. Recidivism, or the rate of repeated punishments, was an element defined in just 4 of the 15 districts.

Reasons for Disciplinary Action

Reasons for referrals and punishments were recorded in all of the districts visited, but varied widely in specificity and number. Reasons recorded for disciplinary actions ranged from two, "behavior" and "attendance," to more than twenty, which included such specificity as "throwing snowballs" and "not dressing for physical education." Terms common to most districts, "truancy," "tardiness," "disrespect," and "insubordination," were often defined in vastly different ways or not at all. In one district, "truancy" was defined as any unexcused absence from class, while in another district it was defined as chronic and habitual absences. Definitions of tardiness were most often formulated at the school level rather than the district level and ranged from "not seated at the time the period bell rings" to "arrival at class after the first five minutes of the class period." Disrespect, insubordination, and defiance were not defined specifically in any school or district visited. "Mumbling," "sullenness," and "wearing a hat in school" were actions characterized as disrespectful, defiant, or insubordinate by teachers when office referrals were made.

Duration of Disciplinary Action

Twelve of the 15 districts visited collected data on the duration of suspensions. The duration was defined as the number of days the student was suspended from school. Data on the duration of exclusions were collected much less frequently.

Table 9 presents the data elements most frequently found in the district forms of the study sites. School and student identification data elements are collected most frequently and were readily available. Data on corporal punishment at the district level are least often available.

Are measures of disciplinary actions reported consistently within and across districts?

Finding

- The quality and quantity of data on disciplinary actions are affected by federal, state, and local programs, which are often not coordinated.

Because all were ESAA-funded, all visited districts report the same disciplinary data on Office for Civil Rights forms 101, 102, 531, and 532. These data include: number of pupils suspended for at least one day, number of pupils who received corporal punishment, number of pupils expelled, and number of pupils enrolled in a program for the socially maladjusted. Some districts reported other disciplinary data on referrals to juvenile court, assignments to alternative discipline programs, and disciplinary actions, classified by gender, to other federal offices such as Title IX and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

TABLE 9

DISCIPLINE DATA ELEMENTS COLLECTED
BY DISTRICTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE

DATA ELEMENTS (N=26)	DISTRICT (N=15)															N	% of Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		
DEMOGRAPHICS																	
School Name (I.D.)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100%
Student's Name (I.D.)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	14	93
Sex	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	14	93
Race	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	14	93
Grade Level	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X		10	67
Age	X			X	X		X	X	X		X				X	8	53
DISCIPLINE REFERRALS																	
Reason for Referral	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	14	93
Type of Disciplinary Action	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	13	86
Prior Action(s) to Solve Problem	X	X	X	X	X			X		X					X	8	53
Person Referring Student	X			X	X			X	X		X			X	X	8	53
Date of Incident	X			X	X						X			X	X	6	40
Time of Incident	X			X	X									X	X	5	33
Place of Incident	X	X		X											X	4	27
OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS																	
Number of Days	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	12	80
Beginning Date	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X			10	67
Date Readmitted	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X				X	10	67
Type of Suspension	X			X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X	9	60
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT			0							0							
Number of Licks		X		X			X	X								4	31
Witness Name and Title				X			X	X				X				4	31
Person Administering Punishment	X			X								X				3	23
EXPLUSIONS				0													
Date of Hearing	X			X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X	9	64
Type of Expulsion				X		X	X	X	X			X	X			7	50
ESAA PROGRAMS																	
Number of Days (Periods) Assigned		X		X	X		X	X	X				X		X	8	53
Number of Days (Periods) in Program		X		X	X		X	X	X						X	7	47
Number of Parental Conferences/ Contacts	X				X					X			X			4	27
Number of Reassignments per Student	X			X									X		X	4	27
Totals	21	15	10	25	18	11	16	19	15	9	14	6	14	12	21		
Percent of Total	81%	58	43	96	75	46	61	73	58	39	54	23	54	46	81		

NOTE: 0 designates that the disciplinary action is not used in the district; percents have been adjusted accordingly.

Some states require districts to duplicate OCR and federal program data for statewide information purposes, while other states require additional data on drop-outs, failures, and repeated disciplinary actions. Districts require other disciplinary data for assessing needs, designing programs, and public information purposes. Table 10 presents the types of summary data prepared for district use in the study sites.

Individual schools report all the data required by their districts, states, and the federal government. In addition, some schools collect data on disciplinary offenses, including time of disciplinary offenses and referrals in order to identify school and classroom management problems. The diverse needs and requirements of school, district, state, and federal programs affect both the quantity and quality of the measures of disciplinary actions reported within and among districts.

Who records and reports disciplinary data?

Finding

- Record-keeping was largely the responsibility of the professional/technical staff in the study sites.

Data reporting was most often a professional staff responsibility. Disciplinarians were most often responsible for recording and reporting data at the schools. In larger schools and districts, support staff did the reporting under the supervision of a professional staff member. Technical or support staff were more likely to have responsibility for the recording function in all districts. (Refer to Table 6, Chapter IV.)

Were the data recorders and reporters trained in record-keeping?

Finding

- Nine of the districts observed provided some training for recorders and reporters of data.

Nine of the 15 districts provided some type of training in recording and reporting data. Most often the training was on-the-job and consisted of oral directions from a person previously responsible for the tasks. Several of the nine districts provided a written set of instructions for the completion of forms and reports. Three of the districts provided formal workshop training for the record-keeping process. One state conducted workshops on a statewide computerized management information system which supplied all districts with statistics for all required federal and state education reports. Six of the 15 districts included training in the design of forms and correct procedures for their completion as elements in staff development programs.

TABLE 10

DISCIPLINE DATA TABULATIONS
PREPARED FOR DISTRICT USE

TYPE OF SUMMARY (N=22)	DISTRICT (N=15) 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
DISCIPLINE REFERRALS BY:																	
School	X	X		X	X	X				X				X	X	8	53%
Reason for Referral	X	X		X	X	X								X	X	7	47
Racial/Ethnicity of Student	X			X	X	X								X	X	6	40
Student's Name	X	X		X	X										X	5	33
Grade		X				X								X	X	4	27
OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS BY:																	
School	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100
Reason for Suspension	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	13	87
Racial/Ethnicity of Student	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X			X	X	11	73
Grade	X	X	X		X	X	X				X			X	X	9	60
Number of Suspensions Per Student	X			X	X	X					X	X	X		X	8	53
Student's Name	X	X	X	X	X	X					X				X	8	53
Sex Within Race				X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	8	53
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT BY:			0							0							
School	X	X		X							X			X	X	6	46
Racial/Ethnicity of Student	X	X		X										X	X	5	33
Reason		X		X							X					3	20
Student's Name		X		X							X					3	20
ESAA PROGRAM STATISTICS BY:																	
School		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	12	80
Racial/Ethnicity of Student	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X	11	73
Sex Within Race	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	10	67
Reason for Assignment to Program		X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X		X	9	60
Student's Name		X		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	9	60
Number of Assignments to Program	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X		X		X	10	67
Totals	15	18	10	19	16	12	10	9	7	5	14	5	8	13	20		
Percent of Total	68%	82	56	86	73	55	45	41	32	17	64	23	41	59	91		

Note: 0 designates that the disciplinary action is not used in the district; percents have been adjusted accordingly.

What procedures and standards are used for recording and reporting data?

Findings

- Six of the districts visited used standardized procedures and forms to record and report disciplinary data.
- Data collected by local ESAA staff on their disciplinary programs were more likely to be recorded and reported on standard forms with clearly defined procedures than were school disciplinary data.
- Seven of the districts audited data collection and reporting at either the school or district level.
- Arithmetic or transpositional errors in data reporting were found in at least one-third of the districts.
- Seven of the 15 districts visited did use disciplinary data to identify problems and trends.
- Districts that had had ESAA disciplinary programs prior to 1979-80 used all disciplinary data more effectively in providing feedback for needs assessment and program design or modification.
- Data collected by local ESAA staff on their disciplinary programs were more likely to be used to inform regular classroom teachers and the public than were school or district disciplinary data.

In all districts the discipline referral form completed by teachers and the written notification of suspension to parents serve as source data. These documents are filed in some way at the individual school site. Six of the 15 districts used standard referral and suspension forms in all schools in the district. Information required by the district is periodically compiled for reporting purposes. Most of the sites compiled the source data on a monthly basis, but one district used six-week summaries and another used twelve-week summaries of the source data. When standard forms are not available for the compilation of data, schools most often use a handwritten log which can be updated daily or weekly. One district used its computer and collected data from each school, on a daily basis. Three other districts were in various stages of computerizing data collection.

Local ESAA project staff also collect disciplinary data for needs assessment, program planning, and program evaluation purposes. Determination of data elements to be collected and procedures and standards for collection is made locally, usually by the ESAA project director. These ESAA program data also use the discipline referral forms as source data. ESAA data are compiled separately by the program staff, using standard program forms or logs which are summarized periodically. All of the visited districts required at least a monthly ESAA program summary.

Four of the 15 districts monitored the record-keeping procedures at individual schools. Three of these four districts used ESAA program staff to review school disciplinary data, and, in one district, central office personnel ran spot checks. Three districts also audited disciplinary data at the district level. The most common errors found were transpositional or arithmetic. One district did discover gross errors in definitions and categorization at one school.

All of the sites visited aggregate disciplinary data at the individual school site. Reporting requirements, however, vary widely. No consistent pattern was observed. In larger districts or districts with a strong central administrative structure, data were more likely to be collected using standard, systematic procedures, and reports were prepared at the district level by aggregating information from standard forms. Smaller districts with fewer administrative and support personnel and districts with decentralized administrative authority were more likely to rely on individual school summary data. Coordination of data collection and reporting was the exception rather than the rule. Data on discipline were often reported to several different offices or individuals and no one person or office was responsible for reviewing trends or proposing uses of the data. Attendance data were not compared with disciplinary data in any district visited.

Seven of the 15 districts were using disciplinary data to determine and monitor disproportion and to evaluate disciplinary procedures and programs in the schools and districts. The 5 districts with ESAA disciplinary programs established prior to 1979-80 generally collected, reported, and used disciplinary data more systematically and effectively. In all districts visited, ESAA program data were more likely to be recorded and reported on standard forms using standard definitions and procedures than district disciplinary data. ESAA program data were also more likely to be disseminated within districts for use by administrators and program staff to assess needs and design or modify programs than were district disciplinary data. In at least three districts, ESAA program data were reported to regular classroom teachers for use in evaluating classroom management practices. No district routinely used disciplinary data for public information purposes. ESAA advisory committees which included public representation did receive some data in each of the districts visited, but the quantity of data provided to such representatives varied widely.

Are data reported by the 15 sites reliable and valid?

Findings

- Disciplinary data reported to OCR were found to be inaccurate in 8 of the districts.
- Expulsion statistics were the data found to be most reliable and valid.

- Corporal punishment data were more likely to be under-reported than data on expulsion and suspension.

- Measures of enrollment in programs for the socially maladjusted showed no reliability or validity among districts.

- Disproportion indices based on OCR data may show less disparity in discipline between minority and non-minority students than actually exists, since repeated actions and duration of actions are not reported.

Data on expulsions were found to be reliable and valid in the 15 sites. Expulsion requires formal Board of Education action and hearings in all the study sites, and written records of these actions provide an accurate measure of expulsion incidences.

All study sites required written notification of suspension, and these written notifications provided a verifiable source of suspension data. However, variations in the definition of suspension and racial/ethnic categories among districts and schools resulted in misrepresentation and under-reporting of suspension data in some districts. As mentioned earlier, two districts did suspend students for one day and report these home suspensions as absences rather than suspensions. Thirteen of the 15 sites used racial/ethnic categories other than the five OCR categories to collect suspension data; thus, inaccurate and under-reporting of minorities may occur. For instance, one district reported suspensions for Blacks and Whites and counted Asians and Hispanics as Whites. In eight of the 15 districts at least one school was found to have reported the total number of suspensions rather than the number of students suspended.

OCR forms do not require information on repeated suspensions or the number of days of suspension. Disproportion indices are thus based on first suspensions. Minority disproportion was greater in those districts that collected and reported data on the duration and repetition of suspensions.

Thirteen of the 15 districts allowed the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary action, yet only three districts required standard forms and summary reports for corporal punishment data. The remaining 10 districts allowed individual schools to determine the procedures for collecting and reporting corporal punishment data. Administrators interviewed in one district reported that they estimated corporal punishment data because there were "too many referral slips to go through." In districts that allowed teachers to administer corporal punishment, administrators agreed that written documentation was not always submitted and all instances were not reported. In the 10 districts without standard forms for corporal punishment data those interviewed agreed that these data were likely to be inaccurate through under-reporting.

Perhaps the greatest confusion affecting the validity and reliability of reported data concerned the definition used in reporting the number of pupils enrolled in a program for the socially maladjusted. Some districts interpreted this measure to include only those pupils who had been diagnosed and placed in special education programs. Some districts reported only those pupils placed in alternative programs outside the home school. Three districts included pupils who were assigned to disciplinary programs within their home school.

While problems do exist in the collection and reporting of disciplinary data to OCR, this national data base does provide a source for identifying trends and issues critical for minority students. OCR data elements were the only data common to all districts visited. Data on expulsions were found to be valid and reliable. Confusion that existed in the reporting of suspensions seems mostly caused by semantic and/or communication problems. Technical assistance to LEAs by ESAA and OCR through regional offices and state education agencies has begun to eliminate some of this confusion. Nonexclusionary discipline data, i.e., corporal punishment and assignment to programs for the socially maladjusted, are much less reliable. Additional efforts to develop more comprehensive and consistent data on disciplinary actions and their causes (reasons) and effects (duration) would add to the usefulness of the data.

CHAPTER VI

A DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES OF ESAA PROJECTS DESIGNED TO COMBAT DISPROPORTIONATE DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS

Three study questions were formulated to guide research on description of ESAA projects designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. They are:

(1) what are the characteristics of these ESAA projects;

(2) do these projects vary among schools in the same district; and

(3) can these projects be classified by a program typology?

To answer the study questions, ten program factors were identified for data collection and analysis. These ten factors are: the historical background of the program; organizational structure of the district, school, and program; financial support; program objectives; program planning process; program services and activities; student characteristics; staff characteristics; program use elements; and program materials used.

Findings on each of the ten program factors will be presented and discussed to determine the characteristics and variations of ESAA projects. The chapter will conclude with findings arrayed according to a program typology of ESAA programs in study sites.

Historical Background

Findings

- All districts perceived that demographic changes increased disciplinary actions.
- In three of the projects, responsibility for program design and program operation was divided.
- All districts perceived "white flight" to be a problem.

Six of the 15 districts in the study desegregated their schools in the period from 1965-1970; eight of the districts began desegregation of schools from 1970-1972. The most recent desegregation effort began in 1974. Several of the districts have revised or amended original desegregation plans as the demographics of their areas changed. Using the Office for Civil Rights Selection Code to describe racial/ethnic relations in the study sites: two districts are under court order for discriminatory practices; three are included since they are ESAA funded; six have submitted

a voluntary plan to ESAA to address racial isolation; three districts are ESAA funded and under court order for discriminatory practices; and one district is being closely monitored by both ESAA and OCR as a "high interest" district.

Since all of the districts receive ESAA funding through Basic Grants, all districts are meeting at least one of three requirements. They are either "implementing a required plan or have adopted and will implement a non-required plan if assistance is made available; have a plan to enroll non-resident children in schools to reduce minority group isolation; or, in the case of districts with minority group student enrollment exceeding 50 percent, are establishing or maintaining at least one integrated school."

Ten of the 15 districts began an ESAA funded project designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students during the 1979-80 school year; one district had a program in its second year of operation, and four districts had operated a disciplinary project for three years or more.

In eight of the eleven districts, the ESAA administrator in the district designed the disciplinary project with input and approval from appropriate district administrators such as superintendents and assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, curriculum, and research. In three of the districts, the disciplinary projects were designed by administrators with no operational responsibility for the proposed project. For the four districts with disciplinary projects in operation for three or more years, the project design involved modifications of programs to improve and/or expand project impact. For instance, two of the four projects with in-school disciplinary programs designed training in disciplinary action alternatives for regular classroom teachers.

All of the districts in the study sample were experiencing enrollment changes. Twelve of the districts had experienced or were experiencing declining enrollments. In only three districts was the student population expanding. All of the districts perceived "white flight" to be a significant demographic factor. Two of the 15 felt that demographic changes were threatening to resegregate schools, a feeling corroborated by enrollment data. At least one-third of the districts had been consolidated or were facing more consolidation. All districts perceived that demographic changes increased disciplinary actions.

Organizational Structures

Findings

- ESAA project administrators' responsibilities involve two levels of administrative structure, the district and the school.
- Districts in which decision-making is decentralized showed greater variations in ESAA program operations from school to school.

- No ESAA project director/administrator was found to be a member of the district or school administrative power structure.
- Administrative support and presence at project training activities were perceived to lend credibility and worth to the project.
- Parental notification and/or approval of project participation was required in all districts studied.
- Public awareness of district discipline policy and due process procedures varied widely among and within the study sites.
- Staffing patterns of ESAA projects vary by the type, locus, and mode of service delivery.
- District staffing patterns showed a disproportionate number of minority staff held positions in special programs dependent on year-to-year funding.
- Perceptions of the effect of minority staffing on disciplinary actions varied, but no data supported any correlation between the two factors.
- Factors which affected the size of the project were: the type of service, facility availability, administrative support, funding level, coordination with the regular educational program, and coordination of all efforts designed to affect discipline.
- The number of students eligible for service seemed to have no effect on the actual number of pupils served.

ESAA programs in all districts must involve two parts of administrative structure, the district and the individual school. In no visited district was the ESAA administrator responsible for the disciplinary project a member of the policy and decision-making structure at either level. The central or district administrative structure consists of superintendents, deputy or assistant superintendents, and directors of instruction, curriculum, personnel, etc. The size of the district determines the numbers of individuals or layers of administrators in the structure. But no matter how many or how few layers are involved, administrative power is generally concentrated in a group of three to five individuals. Enthusiastic central administrative support for ESAA programs was expressed in ten of the 15 study sites.

Principals, assistant principals, deans, and teacher organization leaders or those perceived as leaders by teachers usually constituted the administrative structure in individual schools. In districts with a strong central

authority, ESAA administrators were perceived as administrative equals of school administrators, but in districts where decision-making was decentralized, the school administrative structure was often more influential than the central or district structure. In these districts, principals were usually an integral part of the central structure. Five of the sites were characterized by a dominant district administrative structure, three sites shared decision-making between levels of administration, and seven sites delegated administrative authority to the individual school to the greatest extent practical. Districts with decentralized decision-making authority tended to exhibit greater variations in ESAA program operation within the district than did the other sites.

The relationship of the ESAA project to the regular education program was determined by examining program objectives, participation in training opportunities, administrative participation in project planning and training, and project services. ESAA projects designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions focus on actions which usually begin in a regular classroom and extend to a school administrative office. Yet only seven districts involved school administrative staff in a participatory planning process. Thirteen of the 15 sites included consultation services by project staff to the regular school faculty in the program design. Eight of the 15 districts included some type of in-service training for teachers, and at least four districts planned to expand training activities for the regular faculty in future efforts. One-third of the districts involved administrators in project training. One ESAA administrator commented, "The principal we expected to be most resistant was so supportive that he arranged PTA funding for in-service training for his whole staff." Comments of interviewees in four districts in which administrative participation in training occurred agreed that an administrative presence lends credence and importance to the worth of the project.

All of the districts had written discipline policies and due process procedures. Six districts had revised the discipline policies during 1979-80. Four of the 6 districts invited ESAA input into the revisions. All districts used specified due process procedures for expulsions and suspensions. Minimally, the procedures guarantee written notification, a hearing, and the right to representation for the student. Twelve of the districts guaranteed and specified appeal provisions. Fourteen of the 15 districts with options for alternative assignment to disciplinary programs followed the district due process procedures for such assignments. All of the ESAA projects in the district require parental notification and/or permission of parents for the inclusion of the child in the project. If the project removes the child from the classroom as an alternative to suspension, district guidelines on due process requirements for suspensions are followed.

The greatest variation among districts and schools concerned the distribution and public awareness of discipline policy and due process rights. Some districts published the discipline policy including due process in booklets which were distributed to all parents and required written assurance of possession of the material. Some districts relied on individual school handbooks to publicize district and school policies and procedures.

In these districts, the high school materials generally contain more specific information while the elementary school materials are school-oriented and contain little on due process. Some districts do no general distribution of district and school policies and procedures. Such materials are made available upon request through school, district, and Board of Education offices. Interviewees in at least one-third of the districts commented on parental awareness of discipline policies and procedures. These comments are best summarized by an ESAA project counselor who said, "Our minority parents are passive and do not understand what rights they do have," and a school administrator who said, "The non-minority students and parents are better able to play the game [due process], and thus protect themselves."

Staffing patterns of the ESAA projects vary by the types of services delivered and the locus of service delivery. Three of the 15 districts required multi-racial staffing of the project at each target school, and the racial composition of the project staff was an area of concern in all districts. Administrative personnel in several of the districts located in more rural areas commented that they had problems recruiting and retaining qualified minority staff. ESAA minority staff in other districts were concerned about the tenuous nature of their positions which depended upon year-to-year funding of "soft money" (federal funding). When racial patterns of staffing were discussed or examined at the district level, in all of the districts a disproportionate number of the minority staff were in positions dependent upon year-to-year funding of special programs. As an example of this pattern, one school visited had a total minority staff of eighteen percent, yet no member of the English, Math, or Physical Education departments was a minority. Five of the 8 minority staff were in special programs such as ESAA, Title I, or Special Education. One minority staff member in another district commented, "We're being used to make the numbers come out right."

Perceptions of the effects of minority staffing patterns on disciplinary practices varied widely from school to school and district to district. In schools where records of disciplinary referrals by teachers were analyzed comments ranged from:

> "We have extremists in both races; race doesn't matter, the individual does."

to:

> "Minority staff refer more minority students; they expect more of minority students and won't put up with behavior they ignore in non-minority students."

Data correlating racial staffing patterns with disciplinary actions were available in three districts. No evidence was found to indicate that the racial composition of the staff affected disproportional disciplinary actions against minority students. Data from these districts indicated a correlation between the size of the school and the racial composition of

the student population and disciplinary actions. Disproportion in disciplinary actions seemed to increase as the total student population increased and as the proportion of minority students decreased to below fifty percent.

Size of the ESAA projects varied from school to school and from district to district. Types of services delivered, facility arrangements at the sites, funding levels, administrative support, and coordination with the regular education program affected the number of students served. In one school an ESAA counselor might have a caseload of 200 students per semester while in another district with a different program, an ESAA staff member might deal with as many as 60 students in one day. In no district did the number of students eligible for services as submitted on the ESAA project application bear any relationship to the actual number of students served by the project.

A more important factor affecting the size of the project was the commitment of the district to addressing disproportionate disciplinary actions. Some districts continue to allocate most of their ESAA resources to academic remediation, the major need identified locally as crucial to overcoming minority student isolation. Since new projects were funded under a component of the Basic Grant, other ESAA activities designed to meet local needs were continued.

In at least one district the recycling of staff from a previous ESAA project was of some concern. One administrator said, "Teachers didn't agree with the old project, and now they see a new project with the same old faces. It makes the project harder to sell."

An additional factor that affected the size of the ESAA project was the number of other disciplinary programs and their coordination with the ESAA project. One school's attendance improvement program reduced the number of students served while in another district a coordinated effort of several projects increased the number of students identified as "high risk" and eligible for ESAA project service.

Financial Support

Findings

- All ESAA projects in the study sample experienced a funding reduction in the proposed project plan.
- Reduced funding resulted in a reduced staff, reduced services, or both, in all districts.
- Vocational education or LEAA funded federal programs were most often coordinated with ESAA projects.
- Four of the eight states visited provided funds for disciplinary projects.

- Seven districts in the study sample did exhibit evidence of coordination or liaison with other community and district programs.

- A lack of resource continuity and differing program eligibility requirements affected efforts to coordinate services effectively.

Every ESAA project in the study sample experienced a reduction in funding for the proposed project plan. Funding reductions which result from the federal appropriation process are negotiated with each district, based on their identification of needs. The reduction generally had two effects: a reduced staff operating the project, or a reduced number of schools participating in the project. In some districts both reductions were necessary. Districts with a central decision-making structure were more likely to determine the location of a program according to those schools deemed "most in need," that is, schools with a higher disproportion of disciplinary actions against minority students. Districts with decentralized decision-making authority were more likely to locate the ESAA project in schools in which the principals supported the project goals. Some districts also tried to coordinate the placement of special programs in schools of the district. One district placed a state-funded attendance program in a school which had no ESAA project. Other districts chose to cluster special programs concerned with discipline in the same schools to achieve a concentration of services and effort.

Eligibility requirements of the various funding sources were most often mentioned as a restriction on combining and coordinating services of disciplinary projects. Parental income, average daily membership reported by schools, racial/ethnic population ratios, student achievement test scores, and special diagnostic measures are examples of the types of requirements that must be addressed to justify need and service. Seven of the 15 districts visited did show evidence of coordination or liaison between the ESAA project and other agencies or programs in the community and district. Efforts of all districts to achieve more cooperation and increased effectiveness of disciplinary programs are affected by a lack of resource continuity. Year-to-year funding of programs makes planning and coordination of services more difficult. The change of the federal fiscal year to an October 1 to September 30 cycle has required local project management adjustments. Districts that have not completed management adjustments are less able to plan and coordinate effectively.

Other federal programs providing financial support for services for students who may have disciplinary problems were those funded through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Vocational Education Act. LEAA efforts generally centered around extra personnel in schools who had some connection with the juvenile justice system or police departments in the community. In one district, police-liaison officers with a counseling role were assigned to schools. In another district, LEAA personnel were used for security purposes in the schools. Vocational programs in many districts were designed to provide service

to drop-outs or potential drop-out students who often had attendance or other disciplinary problems. More than one-half of the districts had separate alternative schools or facilities that received vocational funding for students assigned to the facility as a disciplinary action. Special education funding was also used in many districts to provide services to students who were diagnosed as having behavioral disorders. The relationship and coordination of other federally funded efforts to the ESAA projects were often neither well-defined nor developed. Evidence of a coordinated referral process and links among programs was found in five districts. Two of these districts had ESAA disciplinary projects begun in 1979-80, and three districts had had ESAA disciplinary projects in operation for more than a year.

All districts had community resources such as mental health clinics, recreation centers, and other social welfare programs available for students and their families. The use of these community resources usually depended upon the knowledge and effort of individuals in the ESAA project and resulted in program variation from school to school. Two districts provided the ESAA project with a resource manual listing community services. One district used community centers to provide services to students identified through the ESAA project.

Four of the eight states visited during the study provided state funds for special disciplinary projects. Coordination of state funds with the ESAA projects in these states varied from district to district. At least two districts also used local funds to provide an in-school disciplinary alternative in addition to services provided by the ESAA project, but only one district coordinated the services systematically.

Objectives

Findings

- All study sites had written objectives for the ESAA projects.
- Every project included an objective to reduce suspensions and disproportional minority suspension rates.
- All ESAA projects included at least one training objective.
- Approximately one-half of the projects had objectives for human relations/cultural awareness activities or increased parental involvement.
- All ESAA projects had modified project activities, but only one project had modified its objectives.

All of the districts in the study sample submitted written statements of purpose or objectives to receive funding from ESAA to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. All of the districts included at least one objective directed to reducing out-of-school suspensions and disproportional suspension rates. Other objectives of the fifteen projects were tailored to the specific focus or activities of each project. All of the projects included a training or staff development objective. Eight of the 15 included objectives for human relations or cultural awareness activities. Seven of the 15 projects mentioned increased parental involvement as an objective. In contrast, only one project originally planned a review of discipline policy.

Most of the ESAA project objectives included goals to reduce disciplinary actions expressed as percentages or numbers. Proposals for the projects included program indicators to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of the projects. Most of the evaluation plans were concerned with summative measures of program effectiveness. Few projects included program milestones for project implementation which could be used for a formative evaluation. Any attempt to assess the fifteen ESAA projects using the proposal objectives would be difficult. When funding reductions were made, no modifications of the project objectives and evaluation were required. ESAA projects included in the study sample because of the comprehensiveness of project services were, in several instances, drastically different from the proposal descriptions. Only one project observed had modified its objectives; the remaining districts were operating under the original proposal objectives.

Planning Process

Findings

- New ESAA programs were more likely to have an abbreviated or incomplete planning process.
- Modifications made or desired in the projects may reflect a lack of adequate planning.

Table 11 presents the frequency of occurrence of variables associated with the planning process that were identified in the fifteen study sites.

Table 11

FREQUENCY OF PLANNING PROCESS VARIABLES
IN SELECTED STUDY SITES

Variable	Evidence of Implementation	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Total
Needs Assessment prior to planning	(9)	60%
Support of the Superintendent	(9)	60%
Participatory program planning (administrators and project staff)	(7)	46%
General staff orientation to the program	(8)	53%
Administrative acceptance of program philosophy	(7)	46%

Time was the factor most often mentioned when absence of planning elements was noted. Two-thirds of the projects observed were new efforts. Since planning activities during the proposal development stage prior to the awarding of a grant are ineligible for funding, most districts responded by abbreviating the planning process. Such planning activities as pre-service training and coordination and linkage of other program and community resources were most likely to be shifted to in-service activities during program implementation. Time then becomes a scarce resource when planning and implementing occur simultaneously.

Projects that had been in operation for more than one year were more likely to have covered many or all of the planning activities. Only one of the new projects had completed all of the planning activities before program implementation.

Some indication of the effect of abbreviated or incomplete planning may be reflected in the number of program modifications made or planned. A total of 62 changes were specifically mentioned by the 15 study sites, an average of four per project. Table 12 displays the percentage of ESAA projects that have made or expect to make changes in project design, management, and record-keeping.

As can be seen from Table 12, staffing patterns, program procedures, program policies and an expansion of data collection and analysis are the changes most desired by ESAA disciplinary programs.

Table 12

MODIFICATIONS MADE OR EXPECTED IN ESAA PROJECTS

Modification	Made % (N=15)	Expected % (N=15)
Program Design:		
Staffing patterns	40%	33%
Staffing roles	33	20
Procedures	13	46
Philosophy	0	13
Facilities	0	26
Objectives	6	6
Services	20	20
Program Management:		
Policy changes	40	26
Referral system	13	6
Trend analysis	26	20
Program Record-keeping:		
Expanded collection and analysis	53	40
Form modifications	46	26
Centralized and systematic	13	20

Note: Modifications due to reductions in ESAA funding are not included.

Services and Activities

Findings

- All of the ESAA projects provided direct service to students and counseled students individually.
- Nearly three-fourths of the projects provided academic assistance through tutoring.
- Most districts employed counseling strategies based on several behavioral models.
- One-third of the districts provided training based on a chosen behavioral model for project staff.
- Ten of the 15 projects managed and operated in-school suspension rooms or centers.
- Five projects provided resource services and had no daily student supervision responsibilities.

- All projects in the study sample offered supportive services to teachers and parents, usually through individual consultation.

All of the 15 ESAA discipline programs provided direct services to students. Table 13 displays the range of services to students observed in the projects.

Table 13

SERVICES TO STUDENTS PROVIDED BY ESAA PROJECTS

SERVICES	DISTRICT (N=15)																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
COUNSELING:																	
Individual	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100%
Group	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11	73
ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE:																	
Tutoring by Project	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X	11	73
Peer Tutoring				X				X							X	3	20
Academic Assessment	X							X			X		X		X	5	33
Academic Remediation							X									1	7
Extra-Curricular Activities		X	X					X			X					4	27
Cultural Awareness	X	X					X	X		X	X	X				7	47
Career Awareness							X			X						2	13
Student Leadership Training			X				X	X			X	X				5	33

All of the projects included individual student counseling, and 73 percent provided academic assistance through tutoring by the project staff and group counseling sessions. Counseling strategies in the projects were based on various behavioral models. Table 14 presents the behavioral models identified in the 15 sites. Descriptions of the counseling models may be found in the Glossary of Terms (Appendix I).

Most districts purportedly employed several counseling strategies. Observers documented specific training for the project staff in the strategies of a chosen behavioral model in one-third of the districts visited. Project personnel in the other two-thirds of the districts relied on past experience and knowledge in the choice of counseling strategies. Thus, variations in counseling strategies occurred from school to school within the same district, and counseling strategies were labeled after the fact.

Table 14

BEHAVIORAL MODELS USED
BY ESAA PROJECTS FOR COUNSELING STUDENTS

MODEL	DISTRICT (N=15) 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
REALITY THERAPY	X			X	X				X				X	X		6	40%
TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS				X	X		X	X	X					X		6	40
CONTINGENCY MANAGEMENT			X	X	X		X		X	X						6	40
CRISIS INTERVENTION	X	X	X	X	X											5	33
VALUES CLARIFICATION	X	X			X											3	20
SELF-ACTUALIZATION	X			X						X						3	20

Fourteen of the 15 districts had an in-school suspension assignment available as a disciplinary action. Ten of the 15 ESAA projects were directly involved in the operation and management of the alternative assignment.

Nine of the 10 ESAA projects used student isolation from peers as the structure for the in-school suspension alternative. These nine projects were most often characterized by a separate classroom where students who had committed some disciplinary offense were assigned for varying lengths of time. The classroom was highly structured and rules were consistently enforced. Students were required to eat lunch as a group at a time or place different from the rest of the school. No talking to peers was allowed, and most of the day was spent on regular academic assignments. Group and/or individual counseling time was a scheduled part of each day.

Of the five projects not directly involved in the operation of an in-school suspension alternative, one project did provide daily counseling services to students assigned to the alternative. These five projects used criteria other than in-school alternative assignment to identify the student population to be served. Such criteria included referrals by parents, teachers,

administrators, and students themselves. These five projects are best described as resource models since the services to students were not provided in a separate, structured classroom supervised by project staff.

Seven of the fifteen programs described the philosophy of their projects as non-punitive. Two of these seven did supervise students in a controlled atmosphere but characterized the control as a means of "helping" the student more effectively rather than as punishment for a specific behavior.

In addition to direct services to students, all of the projects observed offered services to teachers and parents in support of the project goals and objectives. Table 15 presents an array of supporting services observed in the 15 sites.

Eighty percent or more of the projects provided teacher and parent consultation services and assumed home-school liaison responsibilities. Over fifty percent of the projects used home visits, staff development activities, teacher and parent training activities, and school and community liaison activities to support efforts to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

Table 15

SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED BY
ESAA DISCIPLINE PROJECTS

SUPPORT SERVICE	DISTRICT (N=15)																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
TEACHER CONSULTATION	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	13	87%
IN-SERVICE PRESENTATIONS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT	X	X	X	X	X						X			X		7	46
INTRA-SCHOOL LIAISON	X		X	X	X					X	X		X		X	8	53
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT											X					1	7
PARENT CONSULTATION	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		13	87
HOME VISITS	X		X		X	X	X			X		X		X		8	53
HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	12	80
INTER-AGENCY LIAISON	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	8	53
PARENT/TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS TRAINING		X		X	X		X	X	X	X				X		8	53

Student Characteristics

Findings

- Five disciplinary offenses ranked as the most common reasons for service to students by ESAA projects.
- No disciplinary offenses were found to be exclusively or predominantly committed by any racial/ethnic group.

Disciplinary offenses that ranked as the most common reasons students are served by the ESAA projects are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

MOST COMMON REASONS FOR STUDENT SERVICE
[Ranked 1 (most) to 5 (least) According to Frequency]

Disciplinary Offense	Minority	Majority	All
Fighting, physical threats against another student	1	2	1
Defiance, disrespect, disobedience	2	4	3
Cutting classes/truancy	3	1	2
Disruption of classes; general misconduct	4	3	4
Other	5	5	5

While it has been theorized that certain offenses are minority offenses, no support for that theory was found in the study sites. No category of offense was listed that applied only to minority or majority students. Since site visits were made before summative evaluation data were available, data on race and sex of students served by ESAA projects were not complete. Observation of counseling sessions and in-school suspension alternatives revealed no dominant pattern of race or sex of students served. Preliminary evaluation data in most sites exhibited a reduction in numbers of exclusionary disciplinary actions out-of-school (i.e., suspensions and expulsions). Little, if any, reduction in disproportion, the gap between minority and non-minority rates of suspension and expulsion, was indicated. Several of the districts required an integrated setting

for direct student services. Several districts did perceive grade level to be a significant factor in student services, depending upon the organization of the school district. For instance, ninth graders in a junior high of grades 7 - 9 seemed to receive more service, while ninth and tenth grade students were more often served in a 9th through 12th grade senior high. No data were available to corroborate these perceptions.

ESAA Staff Characteristics

Findings

- All districts had written job qualifications for ESAA project staff.
- Eleven of the projects employed paraprofessionals as well as professionally certified staff.
- Six of the ESAA projects provided pre-service or related in-service training for staff.
- Three of fifteen projects required a multi-racial staffing pattern at each project site.

Sixty-six individuals connected with ESAA discipline projects were interviewed in the fifteen districts studied. Seventeen of these individuals were project administrators. Forty-one percent of the interviewees were minority and 36 percent were women. All of the districts had written job qualifications for the project staff. Fourteen of the 15 districts classified project staff positions as professional, and 11 districts employed paraprofessionals in full-time or part-time positions to assist project staff and administrators. All administrative positions in the 15 districts were professionally classified.

Pre-service training for the project staff was required in four of the 15 districts, and 2 of those 4 districts also provided related in-service training during the school year. Three of the 15 required specific professional certification as a condition of employment. Four of the 15 projects precisely defined the role and responsibilities of the project staff. The most frequently mentioned attitudes and needed skills by project staff are displayed in Table 17.

Three of the districts required a multi-racial staffing pattern at each project school in addition to all other requirements and qualifications.

Table 17

CHARACTERISTICS PERCEIVED AS NEEDED
FOR ESAA DISCIPLINARY PROJECTS

CHARACTERISTICS	DISTRICT (N=15)																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
ATTITUDES:																	
Empathy for Others	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X		9	60%
Commitment to Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100
Responsiveness to Individual Needs	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	87
SKILLS:																	
Human Relations	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	87
Disciplinary	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X		9	60
Teaching Experience	X			X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	11	73
Counseling	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		11	73
Training in Guidance Activities	X	X	X				X		X	X		X				7	46

Utilization Factors

Findings

- Two-thirds of the study projects had no district-wide procedures for referral to the project or service delivery by the project.
- In the ten projects that operated in-school suspension alternatives, assignment to the alternative was most likely to be controlled by a school administrator/ disciplinarian.
- Control of access to the five resource service projects was a function of the project staff.
- Space, student-staff ratios, and disciplinary procedures in districts and individual schools were the most common restrictions on service to students.
- The length of service varied according to project objectives and administrative disciplinary procedures.

One-third of the ESAA projects observed had formal, written program procedures. Projects without district-wide procedures allowed individual schools to develop specific referral and service processes applicable to the needs in a particular school. Variations in length of service and restrictions of service were common among and within districts.

For the 10 projects characterized by supervision of students in a separate setting from the regular classroom, control of access to the project was the procedure most frequently debated. Most projects used the disciplinarian (principal, assistant principal, or dean) as the gatekeeper for student assignment to the project. Several districts did allow teachers to refer a student directly to the project. In those districts with teacher referral procedures, administrators generally wished to change the procedures and gain total control of access to the project. Administrative control of access was viewed as essential to evaluating classroom management practices of teachers and developing effective alternatives for students and the school. Four of the projects did monitor disciplinary referrals of teachers.

In the five projects characterized by resource services to students without direct supervision responsibilities, access to student service was controlled by the project staff. Generally, these projects developed their own criteria for services based on such factors as attendance, past records of disciplinary offenses, student achievement, drop-out patterns in the family and other characteristics of "high risk" students. Administrative input into the student selection process was sought, and administrators were notified of students selected. In one district selection procedures included the requirement that all homes of minority students be visited at least once during the year, while in another district any student who was a sibling of a drop-out was automatically included in the service caseload.

In projects with a disciplinary assignment process, repeated assignments were allowed in all districts. The range of repeated assignments allowed varied from a maximum of two full-time assignments to an unlimited number of assignments during a school year. Variations in the length of assignment to the ESAA project were also apparent among and within districts. Full-time assignment ranged from 3 to 10 days. Part-time assignment ranged from one period of one day to as much as one period each day for a school term. Resource services for an individual student ranged from several weeks to a school year.

Restrictions to service also varied among and within projects. In no district visited was the ESAA assignment or service in lieu of suspension. All districts with disciplinary suspension options continued to suspend students. Districts and schools in which the ESAA disciplinary project was a new initiative were more likely to have expanded the disciplinary guidelines to include using the project or were contemplating such changes. One district, for example, began the school year by suspending any student involved in a fight with another student. By the second semester, one school in this district used assignment to the ESAA project in-school

suspension center as the disciplinary action for a fighting offense. Plans were underway to expand this option to all target schools for the coming school year. In many of the schools, student-staff ratios were controlled, which did limit the number of students served at any one time. In individual schools, the space assigned to the project also resulted in service restrictions.

Availability of Materials

Finding

- Special materials related to the ESAA disciplinary project objectives and strategies were provided in less than half of the districts.

Slightly less than half of the ESAA projects provided audio-visual and print materials specific to the project objectives and strategies. These materials included guidance films and inventories and special remedial and/or instructional texts and equipment. Four of the projects provided bibliographies of materials for project and regular staff that focused on the specific counseling strategies chosen for the project. Two districts used local funds to provide materials for the ESAA project. Districts in which no special materials were provided for the ESAA disciplinary project relied on the inventiveness of the project staff and regular materials available to students and teachers in the district.

Program Observations

Each of the ESAA projects and each of the schools possessed an atmosphere unique to its site. This atmosphere is not easily reflected through a description of program characteristics. To help the reader gain an understanding of how ESAA projects affect individuals, selected observations and interviews from 13 of the 40 sites visited are presented in Appendix V.

Program Typology

Findings from each of the factors used to describe ESAA projects may be used to classify the projects in the study sites. Thus, projects could be classified by type of service, qualifications of the staff, age or grade level of the students served, length of student service, or many other categories. However, a more useful basis on which to make policy decisions on funding, technical assistance needs, and project requirements might be to consider the range of factors or characteristics common to the individual projects and those factors unique to certain projects. Assumptions about ESAA projects could then be based on observed characteristics of a study sample and compared with relevant educational research. An exhibit of the study findings organized by each descriptive characteristic is presented in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2

Selected Program Characteristics

Districts	Administrative Structure		Objectives		Planning Process		Financial Support		Services to			Activities			Access to Project Controlled by		Mode of Delivery	
	Centralized	Decentralized	Specific	General	Participatory	Needs Assessment	Federal	Federal and Other	Student	Parent	Teacher	Academic	Counseling	Human Relations	School Administrator	Project Staff	In-school Suspension Center	Resource
1	X		X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	
2		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
3		X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X		X	X	
4	X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
5	X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
6		X		X			X		X				X		X			X
7	X		X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
8	X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
9		X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
10		X		X			X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X
11		X		X			X		X			X	X	X		X		X
12		X		X				X	X				X	X		X		X
13		X	X		X			X	X			X	X	X	X		X	
14	X			X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X
15		X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		X		X	
TOTALS	6	9	4	11	7	9	11	4	15	8	8	11	15	9	10	5	10	5

64

75

78

It was theorized that a typology of ESAA projects would develop from the descriptive factors observed and reported in the study sites. In fact, no typology did emerge. Three relationships are strongly correlated when the descriptive data are analyzed.

The type of administrative structure of the project and district seems to directly relate to the clarity and specificity of ESAA project objectives. Projects operating under a decentralized administrative structure are most likely to state project goals in general terms without specific indicators of achievement or behavior. The lack of specific project objectives also results in the greater variation in program operation observed in districts with a decentralized administrative structure. Central administration and specific objectives are also related, although not as strongly. This relationship may indicate that, while clear and specific project objectives are more likely under a central administration, the quality of project leadership and management is also a factor.

A strong relationship exists between administrative structure and control of access to the ESAA project. In districts in which the ESAA project operates under a central administrative structure, school administrators generally control student access to the project. There seems to be no converse relationship. It would seem likely that districts with a strong central administration will design projects that require school administrative control of student access to service.

Finally, in those ESAA projects that provide resource services and have no constant supervision responsibilities for students, control of student access to the services rests with the ESAA project staff. When this relationship is compared with the relationship of administrative structure and control of student access to services, it would seem unlikely that projects with resource services would be found in districts with a central administrative structure. Only one of the 15 study districts did have a resource project operating under a central administrative structure. A question that may be raised by these relationships is: Does project design and service depend more on administrative needs than on student needs?

CHAPTER VII

A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE ESAA PROGRAM AND SOME OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE MORE SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS

To develop a means of assessing the ESAA programs, study questions were formulated to provide a framework for the analysis of data from evaluation reports, interviews, and observations. This chapter will state the study questions, present and analyze the data, and identify the significant findings for each question.

Since the study was descriptive in nature without imposed experimental conditions, much of the data are subjective in nature. To assure that comparable, reliable and valid data were reported, trained observers gathered predetermined data through week-long site visits. Statements recorded in interviews or observations were not included as data without validation by at least one other source. In meetings after each site visit, observers analyzed and reported data using consistent formats.

Judgments of the observers were used to assess program effectiveness. While such judgments may not be generalized to all ESAA disciplinary programs, they can provide assessment information on programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students in districts that vary by size, location, population, and program elements.

Do the results of evaluation of ESAA projects designed to reduce disproportionality in disciplinary actions against minority students exhibit progress toward the objective?

Findings

- Specific, objective data needed to assess program effectiveness were unavailable for this study.
- ESAA project data were generally more comprehensive than district disciplinary data.
- In the five districts with summative evaluation data from years prior to 1979-80, total numbers of students expelled, suspended, or corporally punished were reduced but the disproportion of such actions against minority students was not.
- Three ESAA projects did document a reduction in disproportion, as determined locally, for suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment in target schools.

Discussion

In attempting to determine the progress of ESAA districts toward the goal of reducing disporportionate disciplinary actions against minority students, three types of data were reviewed: data collected and reported by OCR; data reported by ESAA; and data collected and reported by LEAs.

The report by OCR on over-representation of minorities in the disciplinary actions of expulsion, suspension, and corporal punishment from the 1978-79 Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey was available. The report presented the number and percentage of minority students determined as constituting over-representation for each study district, and the rank of that excess in relation to all other districts in the nation based on disciplinary actions during the 1977-78 school year. (See discussion of OCR data analysis in Chapter II.) Detailed data on the disciplinary actions by race and ethnicity were also provided. The comparable report for 1979-80 was not available at the completion of this study. OCR did provide raw data on numbers of disciplinary actions and enrollments for 14 of the 15 study districts. Disciplinary actions reported were those pertaining to school year 1978-79, the year before 10 of the 15 projects began. These data are subject to the limitations of reliability and validity previously discussed in Chapter V. Additionally, the OCR data include all schools, with and without ESAA projects. Use of the OCR district data would be inappropriate for project evaluation without further analysis by individual schools.

In developing strategies to explore issues associated with over-representation/disproportion in disciplinary actions against minority students, ESAA prepared Preliminary Disciplinary Action Data Summaries of 52 districts with data collected by ESAA from the districts during the 1978-79 school year. Ten of the 15 districts visited were included in the summary. Disciplinary actions and enrollment were reported by minority/majority categories, and a number and percentage of over-representation was determined. From the material furnished by ESAA, it appears that the analytic method used to determine over-representation was not the same method used in the OCR report. A comparable summary of 1979-80 school year data was not available for evaluation by this study. Use of these data for an evaluation of project impact would also require a further analysis of individual schools, racial/ethnic categories, and types of disciplinary actions.

Data collected and reported by the local districts were of two kinds: disciplinary data and ESAA project data. Data on disciplinary actions were in many instances no more comprehensive than data reported to OCR. Additionally, analysis of the data to determine disproportion was not a standard procedure practiced at specified intervals. Arithmetic and interpretive errors were found from school to school within district data.

Project evaluation data, when available, were generally more comprehensive than district disciplinary data and included numbers and rates of other exclusionary disciplinary actions, such as in-school assignments to disciplinary programs by specific category, reasons for disciplinary actions, and

indices of disproportion of specific actions. Disproportion was usually determined by a comparison of percentages of actions and enrollment for minority and non-minority students.

Since ten of the districts began the ESAA disciplinary project during the 1979-80 school year, no summative evaluations of overall effectiveness were available in these districts at the time of the site visits. Formative evaluation data on the process of program implementation and interim data on disciplinary actions by month, term, or semester were available. These trend data did indicate a reduction in the numbers of students expelled, suspended, and corporally punished.

Five of the districts visited had projects in operation before the 1979-80 school year. In these districts, summative evaluation data were available for at least one school year. These evaluation data generally exhibited successful achievement of specific objectives and reported a reduction in the total numbers of students expelled, suspended, or corporally punished in target schools, but no district reported an overall reduction in the disproportion of these disciplinary actions. In fact, districts with projects that operated in-school disciplinary assignments tended to report a disproportion in these assignments similar to that found in the OCR defined actions.

The initial design of the study was amended to include site visits to seven schools without an ESAA disciplinary project. These are reported as "non-target" schools. Data on disciplinary practices, record-keeping and reporting, and local initiatives in the area of discipline were to be analyzed for comparative purposes. The only consistent difference in disciplinary practices observed in the non-target schools was the lack of an alternative to exclusion provided by the ESAA project. Variation in the definitions and administration of discipline existed in non-target schools as well as in target schools. Required data on disciplinary actions in non-target schools were the same as for target schools. Data collected by the ESAA target-school projects on recidivism, reasons for exclusion, and duration of exclusions were not collected in non-target schools. Observers also noted that disciplinary data were monitored less frequently in non-target schools, and administrators used data on specific disciplinary actions or problems less often to modify school practices and procedures. The same data reporting errors found in target schools were observed in non-target schools; no consistent pattern or correlation was observed. No locally developed initiatives designed to address disciplinary problems or disproportional disciplinary actions against minority students were observed. One non-target school did have a state developed and funded effort to improve school attendance.

Efforts to use data reported on disciplinary actions by OCR, ESAA, and the local districts to assess progress by ESAA projects toward reducing disproportion or over-representation of actions against minority students were unsuccessful. Three barriers to success were the unavailability of needed data, the lack of comparability of extant data, and lack of agreement as to what constitutes disproportion and the methods used to determine disproportion or over-representation.

The most recent data available from OCR and ESAA pertain to the 1978-79 school year, the school year prior to the implementation of 10 of the 15 ESAA projects in the study. Since the study was conducted during the 1979-80 school year, summative data at the district and project levels were also unavailable.

Samples of reports prepared by OCR, ESAA, local districts, and ESAA projects indicate that there are differences in the types of disciplinary actions reported, the racial/ethnic categories used for reporting, and the methods used to determine disproportion/over-representation of minority students. Summative evaluation data from five ESAA projects in operation for more than one year and formative data from the ten new projects did show a reduction in numbers of students involved in three types of disciplinary actions (i.e., suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment) in target schools. Disproportion at the district level, as determined locally, seemed not to be affected. No analyses of target school and non-target school data were performed to evaluate the effect of the ESAA project on disproportion in comparison with the non-target schools. When data on other disciplinary actions such as in-school assignment were analyzed, they tended to reflect a disproportion similar to the district rate for all schools.

Ten of the 15 districts studied did have ESAA project reports available on the numbers and rates of suspensions, explusions, and corporal punishment during a portion of the 1979-80 school year. Three of these reports did document a reduction of disproportion/over-representation of minority students in target schools for the period reported in these three disciplinary actions. Disproportion was determined by comparing percentages of disciplinary actions to enrollment.

Are the ESAA programs perceived to be successful by the ESAA project staff and non-ESAA administrative staff?

Findings

- ESAA project administrative staff in all districts recognized a need for the project, were committed to the goal of reducing disproportion in disciplinary actions against minority students, and expected positive results from the project.
- Communication and successful working relationships among ESAA administrators, project staff, and individual schools were reported in at least half of the districts.
- In at least 60 percent of the districts, regular school and district administrative staff were supportive of ESAA projects and committed to the goal of reducing disproportionality.
- Strong leadership action by district administrators in support of ESAA projects was apparent in slightly fewer than half of the districts.

- Active administrative support for ESAA projects was much more likely to occur at the school rather than the district level.

- Some of the non-target schools visited were affected by the ESAA project in the district.

Discussion

Table 18 displays the results of interviews with district staff during the site visits. In all 15 districts, the ESAA administrative staff expressed commitment to the goals of the projects and recognized the need for combatting disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. When project staff in individual schools were interviewed, 88 percent of the schools concurred in commitment to the project. (See Table 19.) A similar pattern of response emerged during discussions of the results of the projects. ESAA administrative staff in all districts expected that the projects would reduce discriminatory disciplinary actions against minority students, while 85 percent of the project staff in individual schools expected positive program results.

Eighty percent of the ESAA program directors judged the communication and working relationships of the ESAA project staff and individual schools to be effective and successful. ESAA project staff in 60 percent of the individual schools felt they had a successful working relationship with the disciplinarian in the school. Successful working relationships with school faculties and guidance departments were reported by at least 55 percent of the project staff in individual schools.

When data from observations and interviews with individual school administrators were analyzed, stronger support for the projects was indicated. Regular school administrators in 85 percent of the 15 districts expressed support for the ESAA projects, and 85 percent of them agreed with the philosophy of the program. In 64 percent of the schools, administrators recognized that a need to reduce disciplinary actions against minority students existed. Administrators in 70 percent of the districts expected the ESAA program to produce positive results, but administrative leadership through concrete actions to gain broad faculty support was apparent in only 60 percent of the schools visited.

In the seven non-target schools, administrator attitudes and perceptions on the issue of disproportion in disciplinary actions against minority students were divided. Some of the administrators denied the existence of disciplinary problems that reflected disproportionality, indicated that their schools had no need for an ESAA project, and reported that they had no plans to modify present disciplinary practices in their schools. Administrators in other non-target schools acknowledged that disproportion in disciplinary actions against minority students could exist in their schools, professed a willingness to examine and modify disciplinary practices if necessary to improve the climate of

Table 18

VARIABLES PERCEIVED AS CONTRIBUTING TO
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS BY DISTRICT PERSONNEL

VARIABLE	DISTRICT (N=15) 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	N	% of Total
PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT																	
Needs Assessment Prior to Planning	X	X	X	X	X		X	X						X	X	9	60%
Program Support by Superintendent	X	X	X	X	X			X				X		X	X	9	60
Communication Between Central Office and Schools	X			X	X			X			X	X		X	X	8	53
General Staff Orientation to Program	X	X	X			X	X	X	X					X		8	53
Participatory (District and School) Program Planning	X	X	X					X	X				X		X	7	47
Administrative Willingness to Adopt Alternatives	X			X				X	X			X	X	X		7	47
PROGRAM DIRECTOR																	
Commitment to Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15	100%
Communication with Schools	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	12	80
Assistance to Program Staff	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	11	73
PROGRAM DESIGN																	
Individual Counseling	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	11	73
Availability of materials (audio-visual, resource, remedial)	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X					X	X	10	67
Tutoring	X	X	X	X			X	X	X				X		X	9	60
Early Intervention by Staff and Parents	X			X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		9	60
Group Counseling	X							X		X	X	X	X	X	X	8	53
Parental Involvement	X				X	X	X			X		X		X		7	47
Interagency Liaison	X		X	X	X						X	X	X			7	47
PROGRAM STAFF																	
Human Relations Skill	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	87
Responsive to Individual Needs	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	87
Counseling Skill	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		11	73
Teaching Experience	X			X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	11	73
Empathy for Others	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X		9	60
Guidance-Oriented Training	X	X	X				X		X	X		X		X		8	53

TABLE 19

VARIABLES PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL AS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

	School (N=33)																																					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	N	%*
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL																																						
Agreement with program philosophy	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		28	85
Expectation of positive program results	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•				•	•	•		•		•			•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	23	70
Recognition of need for program	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•					•			•		•	•		•	•	•	•			•	•	•		21	64
Active program support	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•		•	•	•		•			•	•				•	•	•	•			•	•			20	61
SAA PROGRAM STAFF																																						
Commitment to program	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	29	88
Expectation of positive program results	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	28	85
Qualifications for position	•	•	•	•	•		•		•		•				•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	24	73
Working relationship with other faculty	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	19	58
Working relationship with disciplinarian	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•			•				•				•	•	•		•	•	•			20	61
Positive relationship with guidance staff			•	•			•		•		•				•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•				18	55
SAA PROGRAM																																						
Early detection of students with problems	•	•	•	•	•	•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•			•	•				22	67
Adequate staff	•	•	•	•	•							•	•	•																								
Adequate work space	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•							•	•	•		•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	17	52
Work space isolated from school activities	•	•					•	•		•	•				•		•	•	•	•							•	•	•	•	•			17	52
Adequate materials provided for SAA staff	•	•	•	•		•											•		•	•							•	•			•	•		14	42
Use of data to monitor program	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•							•		•					•	•			•	•	•	•	•	14	42
Principal identifies teachers who frequently refer students to program							•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•													•	•	13	39
Recommendation for school staff	•	•			•	•			•			•	•	•		•	•		•															11	33
																													•	•				13	39

*Percent of Total

the school, and indicated that they were monitoring disciplinary data more closely since the initiation of the district ESAA project. These administrators also expressed a desire to incorporate disciplinary projects into the regular school program if an opportunity became available.

Differences in administrator attitudes and perceptions of disproportion in non-target schools did not appear to be related to any set of school or district characteristics available to the study. In the judgment of the observers, the attitudes and perceptions of non-target school administrators were more nearly a result of individual philosophies and management styles.

Do the attributes of successful educational programs found in other research studies exist in ESAA programs designed to combat disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students?

Finding

- Three projects demonstrated achievement of at least 50 percent of the attributes of successful programs.

Previous research studies have identified attributes or factors present in successful programs. This study used factors identified in the National School Boards Association study of alternative education programs (cited in AASA, 1979), the Rand Corporation study of educational innovation (1978), and the In-School Alternatives to Suspension Conference of the National Institute of Education (1978). Three areas of assessment were identified: program planning, program implementation and management, and program evaluation.

Since 10 of the 15 districts were in the first year of project implementation, an overall assessment of the success or effectiveness of the projects was impossible because of incomplete objective program data and limited program operation experience. Reduced funding levels and project modifications in staffing patterns and school participation precluded an assessment based on monitoring the proposed workplan. Thus, subjective data from observations and interviews became the foundation for determining project success. Educational research not only assures the reliability and validity of assessment by trained observers, but also provides a framework for the assessment.

Successful programs actively seek community participation in planning, and state project goals and precepts precisely and clearly. A project director with established leadership qualities is selected, and school principals who are supportive of the program are included in pre-service training. Staff (regular and project) observations of similar projects in other classrooms, schools, and districts are arranged before program implementation. Concrete, teacher-specific training which includes mastery of interpersonal skills necessary to the project is provided before and during program implementation.

Once the project is initiated, assistance is available from the project and district on a scheduled and unscheduled basis. Regular project meetings that focus on practical problems are held, and teachers (regular and project) participate in project decision-making. The local development of project materials is encouraged and supported. Administrative support at the district level is exhibited, and planning for the transition of the special project to the standard educational program begins at the time of implementation. Program flexibility is assured through less formal instructional and/or social grouping, more teacher-student personal interaction, and an emphasis on improving the self-image and responsibility of students.

Successful programs plan an evaluation of the program during the initial planning effort. The data collection and record-keeping system designed for evaluation should include seeking out existing records for coordination purposes, developing standard forms and procedures, and training the recorders, collectors, and users of the system. Evaluation data for ESAA projects designed to reduce disproportional disciplinary actions against minority students should indicate: a significant reduction in minority disciplinary actions; evidence of greater self-discipline in students through a lower recidivism rate; increased academic and social skills development and school attendance; more parental involvement in discipline; service to children most in need; and service to a broader range, i.e., race/ethnic or socio-economic, of students.

Figure 3 displays the range of successful attributes identified by the trained observers in the fifteen study sites. Table 20 compares the 15 ESAA projects through a rank order based on the overall proportion of successful attributes achieved by each project. A further description of the success of each project in each phase of program development is presented. Attributes of success pertaining to program planning, implementation and evaluation were grouped, and the percentage of attributes achieved for each phase by each project was determined.

FIGURE 3

ATTRIBUTES OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS
OBSERVED IN ESAA PROJECTS

DISTRICTS	PROGRAM PLANNING							PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION									PROGRAM EVALUATION										N = 26
	Community Input	Clear and Precise Goals and Precepts	Project Director with Leadership Qualities	School Principals Supportive and Trained	Field Observation of Similar Programs	Specific Teacher Training on Interpersonal Skills	Extended Staff Development	Program Assistance from District	Regular Project Meetings	Staff Participation in Decision-Making	Locally Developed Materials	District Administrative Support	Planning for Integration into Regular Program	Less Formal Student Groupings	More Teacher-Student Interaction	Emphasis on Self-Discipline & Responsibility	Formal Evaluation Plan	Coordinated Recordkeeping System	Standard Forms and Procedures	Data Recorders, Collectors and Users Trained	Significant Reduction in Minority Disciplinary Action	Less Recidivism	Increased Attendance and Academic and Social Skills	More Parental Involvement in Discipline	Service to Children Most in Need	Evidence of a Broader Range of Students Served	Totals
1		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		20
2								X	X	X		X		X											X		6
3						X		X	X	X		X		X		X									X		8
4			X	X					X					X	X	X		X	X	X					X		11
5	X		X					X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X				X	X		12
6				X		X								X	X	X								X			6
7		X		X				X					X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X			11
8	X		X	X				X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X							13
9				X				X	X	X									X								5
10								X	X						X									X			4
11									X																		1
12								X	X		X	X		X	X									X			7
13		X								X	X					X			X						X		6
14				X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X			X	X		16
15		X			X			X	X	X	X	X							X	X					X		10

Table 20

A COMPARISON OF ESAA PROJECTS BASED ON ATTRIBUTES OF SUCCESS

Rank Order[1]	District	Percentage of Program Planning Elements	Percentage of Program Implementation Elements	Percentage of Program Evaluation Elements
1 (76%)	1	85%	88%	60%
2 (67)	14	43	88	50
3 (50)	8	43	66	40
4 (46)	5	28	66	40
5 (42)	4	28	55	40
6 (42)	7	28	44	50
7 (38)	15	28	55	30
8 (30)	3	14	66	10
9 (27)	12	0	66	10
10 (23)	6	28	33	10
11 (23)	13	14	33	20
12 (23)	2	0	55	10
13 (19)	9	14	33	10
14 (15)	10	0	33	10
15 (4)	11	0	11	0

[1] All Attributes
(%) = Overall Proportion

Generally, the ESAA projects observed had achieved more of the successful attributes in the program implementation phase than in the other two components of program development. Over 50 percent of the projects had two-thirds or more of the attributes of success in program implementation. There also appears to be a correlation between success in planning and successful evaluation. Projects that selected directors with leadership qualities and planned pre-service participation and training for teachers, principals, and project and regular staff were more likely to have a formal evaluation plan, a coordinated and systematic process for collecting and reporting data, and a decrease in disciplinary actions of those students identified to be most in need.

It might be assumed that projects with a longer program operation experience would be more likely to have more attributes of success. However, the three projects that achieved 50 percent or higher proportion of successful attributes and the three projects that demonstrated less than 20 percent of the attributes of success were all in the first year of operation.

When the three projects identified as most successful through their attainment of attributes of success were described by the selected program characteristics presented in Chapter VI, the following relationships were noted.

- All three projects operated under a central administrative structure.
- Two of the three projects had developed specific objectives.
- Two of the three projects used a planning process that was participatory and that assessed district needs.
- Two of the three projects provided services to students, parents, and teachers.
- All of the projects used a variety of activities (two or more), e.g., academic, counseling, and human relations.
- Two of the three projects operated an in-school suspension alternative; access to the program was controlled by the school administration.

A similar comparison of the three <u>least</u> successful projects to selected program characteristics resulted in the following relationships.

- All three projects operated under a decentralized administrative structure.
- All of the projects stated objectives in general terms.
- None of the projects used needs assessment or a participatory process in planning.

- Two of the three projects provided services to students, parents, and teachers.

- All of the projects provided a variety of activities (two or more), e.g., academic, counseling, and human relations.

- Two of the three projects operated no in-school alternative and access to the project was controlled by project staff.

In summary, the most successful ESAA projects in this study sample operated under a central administrative structure, stated project objectives clearly and precisely, and used a planning process that included a needs assessment and participation of interested parties such as administrative staff, regular instructional staff, and parents.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of this report on ESAA programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students presents summary findings for each of the three research objectives of the study. Recommendations for policy decisions, technical assistance services, and further research based on the summary findings conclude the chapter.

Research Objective I: Examine the reliability and validity of measures of the numbers of disciplinary actions against minority students.

Summary Findings:

- Measures of disciplinary actions required by the Office for Civil Rights are the only measures of disciplinary actions reported by all districts.

A range of seventeen different disciplinary actions were found in the fifteen study sites. Disciplinary actions common to study sites were defined and administered differently among and within the districts. Written discipline policies that prescribe specific actions for specific offenses reduce the disparity in the definition and administration of disciplinary actions within a district.

- Data collected and reported at the school and district level vary in quality and quantity.

Elements used to collect and report disciplinary data varied widely among the study sites. Data elements on race/ethnicity ranged from five recording categories to two. Reasons for disciplinary actions ranged from two categories to more than twenty. Record-keeping was largely the responsibility of the professional/technical staff in the study sites. Sixty percent of the districts did provide some training for recorders and reporters of data, and 40 percent of the districts used standard procedures and forms to record and report disciplinary data. Arithmetic or transpositional errors were found in the OCR disciplinary data of one-third of the study sites. Seven of the fifteen districts did audit data collection and reporting and used the disciplinary data to identify problems and trends.

- ESAA program data were more likely to be recorded and reported on standard forms with clearly defined procedures than were school disciplinary data.

ESAA disciplinary program data were used to inform regular classroom teachers and the public more often than were school or district disciplinary data.

Districts with ESAA programs in operation for more than one year used all disciplinary data more effectively for needs assessment and program design or modification.

- Disciplinary data reported to OCR were found to be misrepresented or inaccurate in over 50 percent of the districts studied.

Expulsion data were most likely to be valid and reliable because of the formality Board of Education action requires. Corporal punishment data were most likely to be under-reported when compared to other OCR measures of disciplinary actions. Measures of enrollment in programs for the socially maladjusted were unreliable and invalid among districts because of misinterpretation.

- Indices of disproportion based on OCR data are likely to show less disparity in disciplinary actions against minority students than actually exists.

OCR data are based on the first disciplinary action for any student. Repeated disciplinary actions and the duration of such actions are not reported. District disciplinary or ESAA project data show an increasing disproportion of repeated disciplinary actions against minority students and a corresponding increase in the duration of exclusion from the regular classroom.

Research Objective II: Describe ESAA programs designed to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

- Districts in which decision-making was decentralized showed greater variations in ESAA program operations from school-to-school.

ESAA project administrators involved both the district and the school administrative structure, but were never considered as members of either power structure. Regular administrative support and presence at project training activities was needed to lend credibility and worth to the project. Factors which affected the size of the project were: type of service, facility availability, administrative support, funding level, coordination with the regular educational program, and coordination of all efforts designed to affect discipline. The number of students eligible for service seemed to have no effect on the actual number of pupils served.

- Public awareness of district discipline policy and due process procedures varied widely among and within study sites.

Parental notification and/or approval of ESAA project participation was required in all study sites. Only one district included a participatory review of disciplinary policy by students, administrators, parents, and teachers as a project objective.

- District staffing patterns showed a disproportionate number of minority staff in special program positions that are dependent on year-to-year funding.

Perceptions of the effect of minority staffing patterns on disproportionate disciplinary actions varied, but no data were available to support or deny a correlation between the factors. Staffing patterns of ESAA projects varied by type, locus, and mode of service delivery.

- All ESAA projects in the study sample experienced a reduction in their funding requests.

Districts adjusted the project by reducing staff, reducing service, or both. Usually the number of schools served by the project was reduced. However, one district did remove one service from the project, rather than lowering the number of schools and children served.

- Efforts to coordinate services effectively are inhibited by a lack of resource continuity and differing program eligibiity requirements.

Slightly less than half the districts in the study sample showed evidence of coordination or liaison with other community and district programs. Vocational education and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) programs in juvenile justice were the federal programs most likely to be coordinated with ESAA projects. Half the states visited provided funds for local disciplinary projects.

- All ESAA projects had written objectives.

Written objectives for the ESAA projects in all study sites included a reduction of suspensions, a reduction of disproportional minority suspension rates, and staff training. Approximately one-half of the projects had objectives that promoted human relations/cultural awareness activities or increased parental involvement.

- Modifications made in ESAA projects or desired by school and project staff may reflect a lack of adequate planning.

Two-thirds of the ESAA projects were implemented during the 1979-80 school year. New projects were more likely to have had an abbreviated or incomplete planning process. A lack of time was the contributing factor identified most often when the planning process had been abbreviated.

- All of the ESAA projects provided direct service to students and counseled students individually.

Most districts employed counseling strategies based on several behavioral models. One-third of the districts provided staff training in the theory and practice of a chosen behavioral model. Nearly three-fourths of the projects provided academic assistance for students through tutoring. All of the projects in the study sample offered some supportive services to teachers and parents, most often through individual consultation.

- No disciplinary offenses were found to be exclusively or predominantly committed by any one racial/ethnic group.

Five categories of disciplinary offenses ranked as the most common reasons for service to students by ESAA projects. These offenses are: fighting or physical threats against another student; defiance, disrespect, or disobedience; cutting classes or truancy; disruption of classes or general misconduct; and other.

- Six of the ESAA projects provided pre-service or related in-service training on the project for staff.

All of the study sites had written job qualifications for the ESAA project staff. Nearly three-fourths of the projects employed paraprofessionals as well as professionally certified staff. Three projects required a multiracial staffing pattern at each site.

- Two-thirds of the study projects had no district-wide procedures for referral to the project or delivery of services by the project.

Control of access to the five resource service projects was a function of the project staff. The length of service varied according to project objectives and administrative disciplinary procedures at the district or school. In the ten projects that operated in-school suspension alternatives, assignment to the alternative was most likely controlled by a school administrator/disciplinarian. Space, student-staff ratios, and disciplinary procedures in districts and individual schools were the most common restrictions on service to students.

- Special materials related to the ESAA disciplinary project objectives and strategies were provided in less than half the districts.

Two districts provided local funds for the development of project materials, and four districts provided reference lists of appropriate materials for distribution to all interested parties.

Research Objective III: Give a preliminary assessment of the overall success of the ESAA program and some of the attributes of the more successful projects.

Summary Findings:

- Three ESAA projects did document a reduction in disproportion for suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment in target schools.

Specific, objective data needed to assess ESAA program effectiveness were generally unavailable for this study. The most current OCR and ESAA data available were from the 1978-79 school year, a year prior to the implementation of 10 of the 15 ESAA projects. Extant data were not comparable because of differences in types of disciplinary actions reported, racial/ethnic

categories used for reporting, and methods used to determine disproportion/over-representation of minority students. Given the state of data collection and reporting systems in the study districts, cause and effect relationships between ESAA programs and rates of disciplinary actions in the district could not be demonstrated.

- ESAA project administrative staff in all districts recognized a need for the project, were committed to the goal of reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students, and expected positive results from the project.

ESAA project staff were only slightly less supportive of the project. Effective communication and successful working relationships among ESAA administrators, project staff, and individual schools were reported in at least 60 percent of the districts.

- In at least 60 percent of the districts, regular school and district administrative staff were supportive of ESAA projects and committed to the goal of reducing disproportion.

Active administrative support for ESAA projects was much more likely to exist in schools than in districts. Strong leadership action by district administrators in support of ESAA projects was apparent in slightly fewer than half of the districts. Some of the non-target schools visited were affected by the ESAA project in the district.

- Three projects demonstrated at least 50 percent of selected attributes of successful educational programs.

All ESAA projects were more successful in the implementation phase of program development than in the planning and evaluation phases. Participatory planning and pre-service activities increase the likelihood of project success and progam evaluation capable of demonstrating success. Length of program operation experience had no effect on project success.

- The most successful ESAA projects in this study sample operated under a central administrative structure, stated project objectives clearly and precisely, and used a planning process that included needs assessment and broad participation.

Recommendations:

- A nationally accepted method of reporting and classifying school disciplinary actions and the causes for such actions should be developed.

Efforts to assess problems in school discipline are hampered by the lack of a common and comprehensive system for the collection of data. OCR collects national data on suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, and assignment to special programs for the socially maladjusted. These data are based

on the first incident for a student, and data on repeated actions and the duration of exclusion due to disciplinary actions are not collected. Other federal, state, and local efforts collect data on disciplinary actions that are defined differently depending on programmatic, political, or other considerations. To assure a reliable and valid data base, disciplinary terms and data elements must be clearly defined and consistent. Through the elimination of forms that require similar information but have different formats and definitions, the reliability, validity, and usefulness of the data collected would be increased without increasing the paperwork burden on schools and districts. A conceptual framework for the collection and use of disciplinary data at the federal, state, and local level that is mutually accepted would assist efforts to identify, diagnose, and treat problems in discipline and discrimination.

- A clear conception of what constitutes disproportionate disciplinary actions for minority students should be developed.

The present arrangement of assessing the impact of school discipline on minority students depends on questionable data, differing methods of analyzing that data, and differing conceptions of over-representation/disproportion. Variations in minority and non-minority disciplinary actions may be due to discrimination that pervades school systems or they may be due to conditions, policies, or management within certain schools. If the fundamental problem is discrimination, the causes are likely to be complex and not easily solved by adding a program to treat the symptoms. Agreement on what constitutes disproportion and identification of probable causes would help districts and schools determine where discrimination in discipline exists and what actions are needed to eliminate the causes of discrimination.

- To address the problem of discrimination in school discipline, a coherent model, based on the results of research and experience in human relations and successful educational initiatives, should be developed and disseminated.

Previous and on-going studies supported by ESAA have identified effective human relations, counseling, and parental involvement practices that result in positive changes in school climate for minority students. Recent research and the results of this study have identified and described planning, implementation, and evaluation factors critical to successful educational programs. A model should be developed that incorporates strategies most likely to be effective in eliminating discrimination in school discipline. Information on the model and technical assistance should be available to local and state agencies concerned with school discipline and its impact on minority students.

- Federal funding at the program level should be contingent upon comprehensive project planning and appropriate strategies based on model programs or exemplary practices for reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

The importance of the planning process to the success of educational programs has been well-documented in research studies. To assure effective use of funds, projects should be assisted and required to complete a specified planning process which would identify disciplinary needs and problems of schools, staff, and students. From information available on model programs and practices, appropriate strategies could be selected that would help schools reduce discrimination against minority students in disciplinary actions. This study was designed to be descriptive in nature. Further controlled evaluation would be necessary to identify effective model programs. The federal government has the resources to provide comprehensive program development assistance to solve critical national problems. Dissemination of information, research, technical assistance, and training to increase local program effectiveness would seem to be an appropriate use of federal resources.

Reference Notes

1. Associate Commissioner, Equal Educational Opportunity Program. Undated Memorandum to Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Elementary/Secondary Education.

2. Office for Civil Rights. Overrepresentation of minorities in suspensions. Staff report, undated.

References

American Association of School Administrators. Keeping students in school: Problems and solutions. Critical Issues Report. Arlington, VA: Author, 1979. (Available from: AASA, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209.)

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

Bolmeier, B.C. Judicial excerpts governing students and teachers. Charlottesville, VA: The Michie Co., 1977.

Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc. Children out of school in America. Cambridge, MA: Author, 1974.

Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc. School suspensions: Are they helping children? Cambridge, MA: Author, 1975.

McClung, M. Alternatives to disciplinary exclusion from school. Inequality in Education, July, 1975, 20.

McClung, M. The problem of due process exclusion: Do schools have a continuing responsibility to educate children with behavior problems? Journal of Law and Education. October, 1974, 3 (4).

Mendez, R. School suspension--discipline without failure. NASSP Bulletin, January, 1977, 61 (405).

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of education statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Pennsylvania State Department of Education. Commissioner's Task Force on Student Responsibility and Discipline. Guidelines for school discipline. Harrisburg, PA: Author, 1976.

Public Law 88-352. The Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Public Law 92-318. The 1972 Education Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Public Law 95-561. The Education Amendments of 1978.

Williams, J. In-school alternatives to suspension: Why bother? In In-school alternatives to suspension conference report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April, 1978.

APPENDIX I

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Glossary of Terms

Disciplinary Terms

Administrative transfer: An administrative action that transfers a student from the home school to another school in the district. This action is used in lieu of suspension and requires the consent of the student and parent(s).

Administrative warning: An administrative warning generally consists of a verbal reprimand with no removal from the classroom. It sometimes includes behavioral probation, denying the student access to certain extra-curricular activities.

Assignment to a district or school disciplinary program: A disciplinary action usually used as an alternative to suspension. Authority for making such an assignment varies among school districts.

Corporal punishment: Physicial punishment administered to a student, usually by means of a paddle. All districts require that the punishment be administered in private, away from other students, and that the administration of the punishment be witnessed. Authority to administer this punishment varies among school districts, with some restricting the use of corporal punishment to the school principal or designee, and others allowing teachers to administer the punishment.

Detention: A disciplinary action that assigns a student to a supervised time after school or on Saturday. It is usually used to replace instructional time lost due to disciplinary offenses such as tardiness or truancy.

Expulsion: An explusion represents an official decision by a local Board of Education to deny a student attendance at any school operated under its jurisdiction.

Involuntary transfer: An administrative action that removes a student from the home school to another school in the district without consent of the student or her/his parent. Involuntary transfer has been judged a denial of due process in some districts.

Referral to an administrator: Referral to an administrator is a disciplinary action that is not in itself exclusionary. However, depending on the administrative organization and efficiency of the school, referrals may include removal from the regular classroom, for as much as a full day.

Suspension: Suspensions, both short- and long-term, are distinguishable from expulsions through a specific time frame when readmittance or reinstatement is possible. Long-term suspensions generally remove a student from school for more than 10 days, while short-term suspensions generally last from one to 10 days.

Voluntary withdrawal: Voluntary withdrawal, the decision by the student to leave school, is not in itself considered a disciplinary action. Yet, administrators in all districts reported that students threatened with explusion were often encouraged to "voluntarily" leave school before formal administrative action occurred. Lack of formal Board of Education action simplifies readmittance for the next school term or year.

Work detail: A disciplinary action that assigns a student to perform work (usually custodial) that will benefit the school.

Behavioral Terms

Contingency Management: A behavior management or logical consequences system structured around the principles of behavior modification and operant conditioning developed by Skinner. Rewards are earned for acceptable work and appropriate behavior. Contracts with students are often a feature of this model. Contingency contracts stipulate the desired behaviors and the rewards to be earned for successfully demonstrating the behaviors.

Crisis Intervention: A model of service using a variety of counseling strategies appropriate to the immediate problem or crisis. Students with a disciplinary problem are isolated with a program specialist for a "cooling off" or "time-out" period. The specialist and student define the problem and seek a mutually acceptable solution to the crisis. An evaluation of the solution is made at a later time, and further service may be provided by community agencies, the regular guidance program of the school, or the program specialist.

Reality Therapy: A model based on the theories and techniques of discipline developed by Dr. William Glasser. Development of trusting relationships between students and staff is emphasized. Students are helped to acquire and maintain a positive self-concept including the acceptance of responsibility, to learn to work cooperatively, and to understand the concept of roles. Through this model, students develop a sense of belonging and responsibility toward the school.

Self-Actualization: A model based on the principles of counseling and therapy developed by Carl Rogers. Rogers believes that both group interaction and the education system as a whole should be developed through an approach to human relationships and growth centered on the individual (a "person-centered" approach). Rather than using a counselor or a controlling system to foster change in an individual, Rogers believes the individual is responsible for realizing her/his power to act and potential to learn. The model emphasizes group counseling which is non-directive. This model also uses principles and techniques developed by Abraham Maslow. Maslow identified basic needs that must be satisfied for the fulfilled, "self-actualized" individual. Schools using self-actualization counseling emphasize the needs of belonging, love, and esteem, in addition to knowledge and understanding.

Transactional Analysis: A model based on Thomas Gordon's theories and techniques of interaction skills training. Communication skills involving "active listening" and "I messages" which are specific, non-judgmental, and openly expressive of feelings are stressed. A six-step problem solving process is used to better inter-personal relationships while resolving conflicts. Projects usually provide parent and teacher "effectiveness" training to reinforce positive interaction skills practiced in this model.

Values Clarification: A model based on a process that encourages an exploration of values in areas of ethical concern by confronting students with concrete moral dilemmas which they attempt to solve through discussion. In the course of discussion, values emerge and become clearer. The process of this model is often used as a strategy in other counseling models such as reality therapy.

APPENDIX II

SOURCE TABLES

A-1. Characteristics of Districts Visited 99

A-2. Characteristics of Schools Visited 101

A-3. ESAA Discipline Program Descriptors 103

A-4. Staff Development Components 105

A-5. Success Elements: District Factors Contributing to Program Effectiveness 106

Table A-1: CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRICTS VISITED

Characteristics	District													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION														
Northeast										•	•			
Mid-Atlantic												•	•	
Southeast				•	•									
South-Central	•						•	•	•					•
Mid-West						•								
Far-West		•	•											
RESIDENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS														
Suburban-Rural					•			•						
Urban							•			•	•			
Suburban		•	•											
Rural				•					•			•		•
Urban-Suburban	•					•								•
Urban-Suburban-Rural													•	
STUDENT ENROLLMENT														
40,000 + over							•						•	
20,000 to 39,999	•				•						•			
10,000 to 19,999								•	•	•		•		
5,000 to 9,999			•	•		•								•
Under 5,000		•												•

Table A-1

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRICTS VISITED
(Continued)

Characteristics	District														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
PERCENT MINORITY STAFF															
50% or more															
40 to 49%	•														
30 to 39%							•	•							•
20 to 29%									•		•	•	•		
Less than 20%		•	•	•	•	•				•				•	
PERCENT MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT															
50% or more	•						•			•	•				•
40 to 49%						•									
30 to 39%		•			•							•	•	•	
20 to 29%			•	•				•	•						
Less than 20%															
DURATION OF PROJECT (As of June 1980)															
1 year	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	
2 years											•				
3 years of more		•		•									•		•

TABLE A-2

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS VISITED

School

ITEM	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	Total No.	Total %
GRADES																																											
Pre-School																			•																		•					2	5%
Grade 1																																										2	5
Grade 2																																										2	5
Grade 3																																										2	5
Grade 4																																										3	8
Grade 5																																										4	10
Grade 6																																										6	15
Grade 7																																										15	38
Grade 8																																										16	40
Grade 9																																										24	60
Grade 10																																										24	60
Grade 11																																										23	58
Grade 12																																										23	58
STUDENT ENROLLMENT																																											
Under 500																			•		•															•					3	8%
500 to 749					•				•	•						•							•												•	•					7	18
750 to 999		•		•				•				•		•	•													•	•				•				•				10	25
1,000 to 1,249											•									•					•					•	•								•		6	15
1,250 to 1,499	•												•					•				•				•							•								6	15
1,500 or more			•			•	•										•							•		•		•													8	20
PERCENT MINORITY STAFF																																											
Less than 20%				*	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•									•	•	•	•	•	•	•										19	48%
20 to 29%						•					•					•				•		•	•									•	•	•	•		•			11	28
30 to 39%																	•				•															•			•		3	8
40 to 49%	•	•	•							•								•																						•	5	8
50% or more																			•																							1	3
PERCENT MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT"																																										
Less than 20%								•					•							•				•																	4	10%
20 to 29%				•						•																•															3	8
30 to 39%			•		•	•	•		•			•		•			•					•									•	•	•	•	•	•				16	40
40 to 49%											•					•		•			•		•		•											•			•		9	24
50% or more	•	•													•				•								•	•		•	•								•		8	20
PERCENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY RACE																																											
White	42	40	65	73	68	65	65	81	65	78	54	70	94				63	55	1	82	51	66	60	89	57	73	6	56	48	10	62	68	63	61	62	56	58	65	49	53			
Hispanic				19	19	23	5	1	2	2	2	8													11	5	6	4	1							3	3					
Black (not of Hispanic Origin)	58	60	35	7	12	5	26	17	33	19	44	22	6	34	50	49	37	45	99	18	49	34	40	11	32	23	87	39	49	90	38	32	37	39	38	39	37	35	51	47			
Indian/Alaskan Native										1																																	
Pacific Islander				1		5	4																													2	2						

* No data available

Table A-3: ESAA DISCIPLINE PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS

Descriptor	District													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
PROGRAM MODEL														
Resource service			•			•	•			•	•	•		•
Peer isolation	•	•		•	•		•	•	•				•	
CONCEPTUAL MODEL														
Academic instruction	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•				•	
Values clarification	•	•			•		•			•	•	•	•	•
Reality therapy	•			•	•		•		•		•		•	•
Transactional analysis	•			•	•		•	•	•		•			•
Crisis intervention		•	•		•	•					•		•	•
Non-punitive philosophy	•		•		•						•			•
Contingency management (behavior modification)			•	•	•					•		•		
Self-enhancement education	•			•						•				
Student-teacher contracting	•	•	•											
FACILITY MODEL														
Separate classroom	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•	•
Designated area										•		•		•
Undesignated area						•	•							
STAFFING MODEL														
Professional	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Paraprofessional	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•			•	•

Table A-3: ESAA DISCIPLINE PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS
(Continued)

Descriptor	District														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
DIRECT SERVICES MODEL															
Counseling (individual)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Counseling (group)	•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Tutoring	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•		•
Academic assessment	•							•			•		•		•
Extra-curricular activities		•	•					•			•				
Peer tutoring				•				•							•
Academic remediation							•								
School-community relations											•				
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES MODEL															
Teacher consultation	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•
Parent consultation	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	
Home-school liaison	•	•	•		•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•
In-service presentations	•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•			•	
Home visits	•		•		•	•	•			•		•		•	
Inter-agency liaison	•		•	•	•						•	•	•		•
Intra-school liaison	•		•	•	•					•	•		•		•
Cultural awareness activities	•	•					•	•		•	•	•			
Parent/student classes		•			•					•	•			•	
Student leadership training			•				•	•			•	•			
Tutoring (beyond basic program)		•	•				•								
Curriculum development											•				

Table A-4: STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENTS

Training Elements	District														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Counseling skills	•	•	•	•			•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•
Program goals and definition	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•				•
Human relations skills	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•				•	
Cultural awareness activities	•	•	•					•		•	•	•	•		
Parent/teacher effectiveness training		•		•	•		•	•	•	•				•	
Contingency management (behavior modification)			•	•	•		•		•	•					
Procedural and form design	•			•	•		•	•							•
Reality therapy	•			•	•				•				•	•	
Transactional analysis				•	•		•	•	•					•	
Crisis intervention	•	•	•	•	•										
Field observation	•				•										•
Values clarification	•	•			•										
Academic assessment								•					•		
Contracting	•														
Home visitation skills				•											
Peer facilitating					•										
Remedial instructional techniques					•										

TABLE A-5

SUCCESS ELEMENTS

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS[1]

I. DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

PERSONNEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Superintendent: program support	X	X	X	X	X			X				X		X	X
Program Director: commitment to program	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X
organizational/management skill	X			X	X			X							
Communication: central office/school	X			X	X			X			X	X		X	X
RECORD-KEEPING															
Systematic data collection: program				X	X	X	X	X	X					X	
discipline	X			X	X		X	X						X	
Program design: application of discipline data	X			X	X	X	X	X						X	
Evaluation: utilization of data	X						X	X						X	
DISCIPLINE CODE															
Consistent interpretation	X			X											
Parent/school input					X			X							
Consistent due process procedures	X			X			X	X	X						
PROGRAM DESIGN															
Conceptual state: prior research	X				X										X
field observations	X														X
involvement of school administrators	X			X		X	X	X	X					X	
Comprehensive planning	X				X		X	X	X						
Non-punitive philosophy	X		X		X								X	X	
Pre-service design	X					X									
In-service design	X				X								X	X	
Prescribed procedures	X						X	X					X		

[1]Though a district may have a specific factor, it is only designated when the factor is viewed as one which has made a direct contribution to program effectiveness and success.

TABLE A-5 (continued)

SUCCESS ELEMENTS

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

II. PROGRAM DESIGN

PROGRAM STAFF	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Pre-service training	X		X			X								X	
Relative in-service	X													X	
Specific staff requirements							X			X		X			
Precise role definition/job description	X						X						X		X
Adequate staffing	X												X	X	X
Staff attitude: empathy for others	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
commitment to program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
responsive to individual needs	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

PROGRAM ELEMENTS															
Specified operational design	X						X						X		X
Structured setting	X			X	X								X		X
Low student/staff ratio	X			X	X					X			X		X
Non-punitive approach	X		X	X	X	X							X	X	
Peer isolation strategy	X			X	X		X	X	X				X		X
Tutoring strategy	X	X	X	X			X	X	X				X		X
Counseling strategy	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Parental involvement	X				X	X	X			X		X		X	
Private telephone	X											X	X		
Full-time paraprofessional aide	X								X				X	X	X

RECORD-KEEPING															
Prescribed record-keeping	X			X	X		X	X					X	X	X
Systematic reporting procedures	X			X	X		X	X					X	X	X
Form specificity	X			X			X	X	X				X		X

TABLE A-5 (Continued)

SUCCESS ELEMENTS

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

III. SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

	DISTRICT														
ADMINISTRATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Principal's attitude: program support	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
philosophical agreement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
empathy for others	X						X	X	X						
need recognition	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Communication: program staff/disciplinarians	X	X	X	X		X					X	X		X	
Leadership for faculty support	X						X	X						X	
Consistent discipline policy	X			X				X							X
Positive program expectation	X			X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
DISCIPLINE															
Procedures: consistent application	X			X			X	X							
humanistic approach	X			X			X	X	X				X		
Parent/staff input to discipline code						X		X							
Administrative willingness to adopt alternatives	X			X				X	X			X	X	X	
Record-keeping: systematic		X	X	X			X	X					X	X	
centralized	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X

APPENDIX III

STUDY METHODOLOGY

A. Sample Letter for Chief State School Officers (CSSO) 111

B. Sample Letter for Superintendents of Schools 112

C. Preview Materials Requested from School Districts 113

D. Overview of Study. 114

E. Interviewer Profiles 115

F. Interview Check List 120

G. Outline for Site Visitations (Case Studies) 121

A. SAMPLE LETTER FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

(USOE Letterhead)

Dear

The Office of Education is sponsoring a study of Emergency School Aid Act funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. This study, which is being carried out under contract to USOE by JWK International Corporation, arises out of the national concern for keeping minorities in school. It is part of an internal review of Office of Education programs and is not a Title VI compliance review.

One school system in your state, West Orange - Cove Consolidated Independent School District, is among the 15 sites that will be visited for this project. The enclosed letter will be sent to the superintendent of this system shortly.

As you can see from the enclosed summary of this project, this is a descriptive study of ESAA projects underway and not an evaluation of individual local projects. Staff from JWK will visit the sites in April and May of this year.

This study is being coordinated with the Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems (CEIS) of the Council of Chief State School Officers and has EVAL Code number 345.

If you should have any questions, please call Mr. Robert York of the U.S. Office of Education at Area Code (202) 245-8857 as soon as possible. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shirley McCune
Associate Commissioner for
Equal Educational Opportunity Programs

John W. Evans
Assistant Commissioner for
Evaluation and Dissemination

Enclosures

cc: CEIS Representative
CEIS State Coordinator
Chief State School Officer

B. SAMPLE LETTER FOR LOCAL SUPERINTENDENTS

(USOE Letterhead)

Dear

The U.S. Office of Education is sponsoring a study of Emergency School Aid Act programs for reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. Your program is among the 15 selected from 79 that were funded this year for this purpose. We would like to include your program in our study.

This is a national descriptive study, not an evaluation of your particular local project. As the enclosure indicates, the contractor for the study, JWK International Corporation, would be spending a week in several of your schools talking with staff, observing this program and examining data collected on disciplinary matters.

If you have any questions, please call Robert York of the U.S. Office of Education at Area Code (202) 245-7997 or Dr. Elizabeth Haven at JWK International at Area Code (703) 750-3240.

Sincerely,

Shirley McCune
Associate Commissioner for Equal
Educational Opportunity Programs

John W. Evans
Assistant Commissioner for
Evaluation and Dissemination

Enclosure

cc: Chief State School Officer
CEIS Representative

C. PREVIEW MATERIALS REQUESTED FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS[1]

1. List of all schools in the system and the following types of information for each: grade span, minority enrollments by race, total school enrollment, and identification of the schools which are involved in the project to reduce disproportionality in disciplinary actions against minority students.

2. Descriptive materials about this ESAA Program, including results from surveys used to obtain data for the ESAA Basic Grant proposal.

3. Copies of district and school forms, pupil records and referral forms, and survey instruments for collecting and recording disciplinary information. These are forms from which statistics have been or will be compiled, and include special survey instruments from state and federal sources. Completed sample forms will be extremely helpful in getting an idea of the way in which the information was reported.

4. Copies of publications, reports, surveys, special studies, newspaper clippings, and other materials concerned with local discipline problems.

5. Summary tables of disciplinary statistics, including trend data, which are not part of reports previously mentioned.

6. Job descriptions for people interviewed in this study.

7. All other relevant data (e.g., School Board minutes, district memoranda describing procedures for collecting data at the local level and for transmitting data from the school to the superintendent's office.

---

[1] This is a guide for use in discussions with district contact person. These materials should be obtained prior to the site visitation.

D. OVERVIEW OF STUDY

REDUCTION OF DISPROPORTIONATE DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AGAINST MINORITY STUDENTS

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

A national study of programs concerned with keeping minority students in school and, more specifically, with reducing disproportionate disciplinary actions taken against them is being conducted by the U. S. Office of Education. The seriousness of this concern is documented in national statistics released by the Office for Civil Rights. While black students comprise about 15 percent of the total student population, they account for 28 percent of the total number of one-time suspensions, 32 percent of multiple suspensions and 34 percent of expulsions.

Seventy nine school systems receiving funds under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) for the 1979-1980 school year listed as a purpose of their programs the reduction of disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students. From that list, 15 programs have been selected. These selected programs include a diversity of activities beyond academic remediation and show evidence of the maintenance of comprehensive records on disciplinary actions.

Project Objectives

The study is expected to provide the following:

- Description of the scope of program activities funded under the ESAA Program.
- Identification of program elements that appear to be successful in reducing disciplinary actions against minority students.
- Assessment of local measures used for reporting disciplinary actions.

Project Procedures

The contractor for this study is JWK International Corporation, a research firm located in Annandale, Virginia. Five professional staff members from this company will visit the 15 sites during March and April of 1980. They will talk with local ESAA project directors, school principals and staff members concerned with maintaining discipline and discipline records. They will also have informal discussions with teachers and students involved in or affected by ESAA programs. No more than three schools will be visited in any one school system.

Use of Results

This project is <u>not</u> an evaluation of local ESAA programs. It is a descriptive study of projects currently in operation. What we learn should be helpful to other school systems involved with similar programs. What we learn about record keeping and the accuracy of the disciplinary statistics available will be important in any future data collection efforts. The results of this study may be used later in designing a more comprehensive assessment of future ESAA programs in this area.

INTRODUCING: Dr. Elizabeth W. Haven
Senior Associate
JWK International Corporation
Annandale, VA 22003

Dr. Haven has been in education over 25 years. Her experiences include teaching and chairing a high school mathematics department, conducting research for a state education association, monitoring national testing and research programs, and directing studies for Government and other nonprofit associations.

Dr. Haven has also been lecturer for workshops in testing, and consultant for Ford Foundation and other Governmental agencies. She is currently project director of the USOE descriptive study of ESAA funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

INTRODUCING: Ms. Sondra Cooney
Associate
JWK International Corporation
Annandale, VA 22003

Ms. Cooney has an extensive school-related background. She taught for eight years in a variety of settings in Illinois and California. Her experience includes working in self-contained classrooms, horizontal team teaching, and multi-age team teaching. She was a Master Team Leader and Supervising Teacher in a M.A.F. program.

Ms. Cooney spent four years in a state education agency in the Bureau of Technical Assistance. In this capacity, she coordinated statewide programs in such areas as consumer education, social studies education and adolescent pregnancy. She also assisted local educational agencies in program development in all areas.

Ms. Cooney has served as a consultant with such organizations as the Merrimac Education Center, Brown University and the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, U.S. Public Health Service (HEW).

INTRODUCING: Mr. Thomas Oliver
Research Analyst
JWK International Corporation
Annandale, VA 22003

Mr. Oliver has had a number of years of experience in public education. As a teacher, he worked with handicapped and gifted students. As a state education office employee, he pro··ided technical assistance to local education agencies and school districts in the areas of program development and evaluation.

Most recently, Mr. Oliver has participated in a number of studies: visiting over 60 local education agencies throughout the United States and interviewing approximately 700 administrators, teachers and parents.

Mr. Oliver is an interviewer for the USOE descriptive study of ESAA funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

INTRODUCING: Miss Margaret McMullen
Associate
JWK International Corporation
Annandale, VA 22003

Miss McMullen's 16 years of experience as a practitioner in the public schools of Virginia has included working with students in urban, suburban and rural settings. Her teaching experience has included working with students in self-contained classrooms and multi-age and team teaching grouping patterns, as well as with students from varied economic backgrounds.

Most recently, Miss McMullen was principal of a large, urban elementary school having a minority population in excess of 60%. In this role, she supervised special education programs for educable mentally retarded, learning disabled and emotionally disturbed students. In addition, she also worked with ESAA and Title I programs.

Miss McMullen has served as a consultant with such organizations as the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities and USOE. She is currently an interviewer for the USOE descriptive study of ESAA funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

INTRODUCING: Mr. Thomas Dial
Research Associate
JWK International Corporation
Annandale, VA 22003

Mr. Dial is a research sociologist, with an extensive background in interviewing respondents for numerous research projects. As a researcher, he has concentrated on analyzing social problems with an emphasis on the effects of various aspects of socioeconomic stratification on these problems. Most recently, Mr. Dial has worked on a detailed analysis of the characteristics of welfare families for the Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration. He has also been a college instructor.

Mr. Dial is presently completing a doctoral dissertation in social relations at The Johns Hopkins University. He is an interviewer for the USOE descriptive study of ESAA funded programs to reduce disproportionate disciplinary actions against minority students.

E. INTERVIEW CHECK LIST

LEA _____ DATE _____

SCHOOL BUILDING _____ T NT (Circle one) GRADES _____

NAME OF PERSON INTERVIEWED _____ PHONE ( ) _____ (Area)

TITLE _____ PA DR P D SR PS (Circle one)

I. STAFF

___ 1. Preservice training for job
D___ 2. Inservice training for job
3. Work experience
D___ 4. Job description
5. Job satisfaction

II. SCHOOL DISCIPLINE (Policy & Statistics)

D —— 6. Need for ESAA Project
D —— 7. District & building policies
—— 8. Formulators of policy
9. Influence of state regulations

—— 10. Definitions of disciplinary measures
—— 11. Punishments for transgressions
—— 12. Code administration (flexibility)
D —— 13. Most common offenses
D —— 14. Student offenses & punishments by race
D —— 15. Percents of minorities/nonminorities punished

III. RECORDKEEPING

16. History
17. Student referral process
D —— 18. Forms & their uses
—— 19. Types of data and dates
—— 20. Definitions of terms
—— 21. Definition compatibility across forms
—— 22. Form compatibility across school/LEA/SEA/Federal levels

D —— 23. Recording procedures & quality control
D —— 24. Transmitting procedures-district/school
—— 25. Procedures for aggregating statistics
D —— 26. Types of summary statistics
—— 27. Use of summary statistics

D —— 28. Trend data
29. Changes in procedures
—— 30. Problems/recommendations for improvement

IV. CLIMATE

D —— 31. School and staff racial composition
32. Desegregation history
33. Effect of desegregation on discipline
—— 34. Perceptions: racial climate/human relations
—— 35. Racial incidents in school
—— 36. Racial incidents in community

V. ESAA PROGRAM

37. Impetus for project
D —— 38. Program overview
—— 39. Program goals
40. Specific activities

41. Method of implementation
—— 42. Types of positions
—— 43. New staff added
D —— 44. Staff training
45. Special materials used

—— 46. Problems encountered
—— 47. Changes made
48. Changes anticipated
—— 49. Goals achieved
—— 50. Activities impacting school discipline
—— 51. Evidence of program effectiveness
52. Evidence of support: staff, students, parents
53. Evaluation methods

NOTE 1: A line preceding an item means that this must be addressed in the discussions. Please check when this condition has been fulfilled.

NOTE 2: A "D" preceding a line indicates that a document should be obtained. Some of these documents may be statistical tables.

_____ (Interviewer)

Project: Descriptive Study of ESAA Funded Programs to Reduce Disproportionate Disciplinary Actions Against Minority Students

Project Director: Elizabeth W. Haven

Date: June 4, 1980

F. OUTLINE FOR SITE VISITATIONS

(CASE STUDIES)

I. INTRODUCTION (SETTING)

A. District demographics
(E.g., number of schools by grade level, percent enrollment by race, local conditions)

B. Interviewees demographics
(E.g., number, percent minority, qualifications)

C. District climate

1. History of desegregation

2. Staff perceptions of racial climate

a. Relationship between job responsibility and attitudes toward racial climate

3. Racial incidents

II. DISCIPLINE AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL

A. Discipline Code

1. Basic provisions

2. Administration

3. State laws affecting Code

B. Record-keeping

1. Reporting procedures

2. Forms used

3. Statistics collected

a. Office for Civil Rights information

b. Other

4. Problem areas

III. ESAA DISCIPLINE PROJECT (OVERVIEW)

A. Origin/need

1. Suspension statistics by race

B. Project description

1. Goals

2. Activities

C. Implementation

1. Administrative support

2. Staffing

3. Pre-service and in-service training

4. Other

D. Project modifications

1. Changes made

2. Changes proposed

E. Evaluation

1. Statistics

2. Surveys

3. Other

IV. SITE VISITATIONS IN TARGET SCHOOLS
(Report separately by school: School #1 - selected by district; School #2 - selected at random)

A. School demographics
(E.g., type of school, percent enrollment by race, percent staff by race, special problems)

B. Discipline at the school level

1. Administration

2. Record-keeping

a. Procedures

b. Forms used

c. Problem areas

C. ESAA Discipline Project

1. Type of facility(ies)

2. Staff

a. Qualifications

b. Other characteristics

3. Program guidelines

4. Activities observed

5. Staff reactions to project

a. Successful components

b. Problem areas

6. Project modifications

7. Project record-keeping

a. Reporting procedures

b. Forms used

c. Form modifications

d. Problem areas

V. SITE VISITATIONS IN NON-TARGET SCHOOLS

A. School demographics
(E.G., type of school, percent enrollment by race, percent staff by race, area served, special problems)

B. Discipline at the school level

1. Administration

2. Record-keeping

a. Procedures

b. Forms used

c. Problem areas

C. Special programs and/or techniques for maintaining discipline

D. Other (comments, perceptions, reactions, etc.)

VI. OTHER ACTIVITIES RELATED TO DISCIPLINE (state and locally funded)

A. Alternative Education programs

B. Special projects (community and school)

VII. SUMMARY

A. Factors contributing to project success

B. Problem areas in record-keeping

C. Relevant comments

Attachments to this final report will include the following:

I. Selected program materials

II. Selected data collection forms

III. Selected references

A P P E N D I X IV

SAMPLE DISCIPLINE REPORTING FORMS

A-B. Office Referral Forms (2) 127

C. Student Discipline Report to Parents 129

D. Notification of Out-of-School Suspension (letter) 130

E. Notification of Suspension. 131

F-G. Suspension Summary Sheets (2) 132

H. Home Visitation Report. 135

A. OFFICE REFERRAL FORM

STUDENT REFERRAL

_____
Date

DATE_____ GRADE_____ PERIOD_____

NAME_____ TEACHER REFERRING_____

( ) INSTIGATING A FIGHT OR FIGHTING IN CLASSROOM

( ) USE OF TOBACCO, DRUGS, OR ALCOHOL ON SCHOOL GROUNDS OR SCHOOL BUS

( ) INAPPROPRIATE CLOTHING OR APPEARANCE

( ) OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE

( ) REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH ANY REASONABLE REQUEST OF A TEACHER OR SCHOOL PERSONNEL

( ) STRIKING A TEACHER OR OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL

( ) COMMITTING ACT OF DEFIANCE, EITHER IN LANGUAGE OR ACTION

( ) UNEXCUSED TARDY OR ABSENCES NUMBER _____

( ) CHEATING OR DISHONESTY ON SCHOOL WORK

( ) STEALING

( ) FORGING OR USING FORGED NOTES OR EXCUSES

( ) INVOLVEMENT WITH FIREWORKS OR OTHER EXPLOSIVES

( ) CARRYING OR USING INSTRUMENTS TO DO BODILY HARM

( ) UNAUTHORIZED PRESENCE DURING TRUANCY OR SUSPENSION ON SCHOOL GROUNDS

( ) THREATENING A TEACHER OR OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL

( ) INITIATING FALSE FIRE ALARMS OR OTHER FALSE ALARMS

( ) WILFUL DEFACING OR DESTROYING OF SCHOOL PROPERTY. PUPIL OR PARENTS ARE REQUIRED TO PAY COST OF REPAIRS OR REPLACEMENT

( ) OTHER _____

EXPLANATION _____

REFERRED TO: ( ) ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

( ) PRINCIPAL

( ) COUNSELOR

I HAVE DONE THE FOLLOWING:

( ) 1. CONFERENCE WITH PUPIL BEFORE OR AFTER SCHOOL.

( ) 2. NOTE OR PROGRESS REPORT TO PARENT.

( ) 3. CALL TO PARENT.

OTHER _____

TEACHER RECOMMENDATION _____

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TAKEN

( ) 1. COUNSELED

( ) 2. PUNITIVE ACTION

( ) 3. SUSPENSION

( ) 4. (A) PARENTS WERE CONTACTED
(B) PARENT CONFERENCE SCHEDULED

( ) 5. PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION RECOMMENDED

( ) 6. DO NOT READMIT TO YOUR CLASS UNTIL CLEARED BY THE OFFICE.

( ) 7. OTHER OR RECOMMENDATION_____

_____
Administrator or Counselor

B. OFFICE REFERRAL FORM

CANTIGNY N Y C OR 9-6931

WRITE FIRMLY WITH BALL POINT PEN

STUDENT REFERRAL

STUDENT'S NAME (LAST)	(FIRST)	CLASS	DATE

PERIOD	ROOM	TEACHER	DATES OF PREVIOUS REFERRALS

STEPS TAKEN BY TEACHER

- ☐ VERBAL WARNING
- ☐ REFFERAL TO SUPERVISOR
- ☐ PHONE CALL OR NOTE TO PARENTS
- ☐ DETENTION WITH TEACHER
- ☐ PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCE
- ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

REFERRAL SPECIFICS

ACTION TAKEN BY DEAN

- ☐ CONFERENCE WITH PUPIL (VERBAL WARNING)
- ☐ PHONE CALL OR NOTE TO PARENTS
- ☐ DEAN'S CONFERENCE
- ☐ PRE-SUSPENSION CONFERENCE
- ☐ PRINCIPAL'S CONFERENCE
- ☐ REFERRAL TO GUIDANCE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

DATE _____ SIGNATURE _____

C. DISCIPLINE REPORT TO PARENTS

MIS. 13.04
Review 8-80
Revised 12-79

STUDENT DISCIPLINE REPORT SHEET

STUDENT'S NAME	SEX	ESE STUDENT	DATE OF INCIDENT	TIME	COURSE/GRADE
	☐ M ☐ F	YES ___ NO ___			
SCHOOL	**RACE**		**REFERRED BY:**		**TITLE**
	WH ☐ BLK ☐ IND ☐ ORIENT ☐ SP ☐				

NOTICE TO PARENTS

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT IS TO INFORM YOU OF A DISCIPLINARY INCIDENT INVOLVING YOUR CHILD.
2. YOU ARE URGED TO APPRECIATE THE ACTION TAKEN AND TO COOPERATE WITH THE CORRECTIVE ACTION INITIATED.

REASON(S) FOR REFERRAL:

- ☐ CUTTING CLASS
- ☐ EXCESSIVE TARDINESS
- ☐ SKIPPING SCHOOL
- ☐ USE OF PROFANITY
- ☐ FIGHTING
- ☐ DESTRUCTION OF SCHOOL PROPERTY
- ☐ POSSESSION OR USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
- ☐ VERBAL ABUSE, STUDENT ___ TEACHER ___
- ☐ THREATENING, STUDENTS ___ TEACHER ___
- ☐ OTHER _____
- ☐ CLASSROOM DISRUPTION
- ☐ DEFIANCE OF AUTHORITY
- ☐ CONCEALING A WEAPON
- ☐ RUDE/DISCOURTEOUS
- ☐ STEALING
- ☐ SMOKING

COMMENTS: _____

ACTION TAKEN PRIOR TO REFERRAL:

- ☐ CHECKED STUDENT'S FOLDER
- ☐ HELD CONFERENCE WITH STUDENT
- ☐ SENT PREVIOUS REPORT HOME
- ☐ IN-CLASS DISCIPLINE
- ☐ CONSULTED COUNSELOR
- ☐ TELEPHONED PARENT
- ☐ DETAINED STUDENT AFTER SCHOOL
- ☐ CHANGED STUDENT'S SEAT
- ☐ HELD CONFERENCE WITH PARENT
- ☐ OTHER _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY STUDENT

HAVE YOU BEEN INFORMED OF CHARGES AGAINST YOU? YES ___ NO ___
HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOUR VERSION? YES ___ NO ___
STUDENT'S STATEMENT: _____

_____ STUDENT'S SIGNATURE

ACTION TAKEN BY ADMINISTRATOR

- ☐ REGRETS INCIDENT, COOPERATIVE
- ☐ WILL MAKE UP TIME
- ☐ CONFERENCE WITH PUPIL
- ☐ REFERRED TO COUNSELOR
- ☐ CONFERENCE WITH PARENT
- ☐ REFERRED TO SPECIAL PROGRAM
- ☐ WORK ASSIGNMENT
- ☐ DETENTION
- ☐ ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSELING

☐ IN LIEU OF SUSPENSION, PARENT CONFERENCE REQUESTED. DATE _____, TIME _____

☐ SUSPENSION (BOARD ____ SCHOOL ____) NO. OF DAYS _____
(IF BOARD SUSPENDED, STUDENT WAS ADVISED OF HEARING TO BE HELD AT AREA OFFICE. YES ___ NO ___)

☐ CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ADMINISTERED BY _____ WITNESSED BY _____

☐ OTHER ACTION TAKEN: _____

_____ TIME _____ DATE

TIME STUDENT WAS RETURNED TO CLASS _____
(RETAIN THIS FORM IN YOUR SCHOOL)

_____ ADMINISTRATOR'S SIGNATURE

WHITE-PARENT CANARY-OFFICE PINK-TEACHER GOLDENROD-GUIDANCE

DCF 12/79

D. NOTIFICATION OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION

Date:

School:

Parent/Guardian

Student:

Grade:

Dear

I regret to inform you that on_____, your son/daughter/ward was charged with the following serious misconduct:

On_____, a hearing/conference was held in my office that complied with due process procedures.

Section 232.26, Florida Statutes, provides that a school principal may suspend a student for wilful disobedience, for open defiance of authority of a member of the staff, for use of profane or obscene language, for other serious misconduct, and for repeated misconduct of a less serious nature and for other acts specified in Section (1) Student Conduct Code, Policy 5.18, provided the suspension does not exceed (10) days.

On the basis of substantial evidence available to me supporting the above charges, I am hereby suspending _____from school attendance for a period of _____ days effective _____ through _____.

Your son/daughter will be in violation of this suspension if he/she is on the school premises without prior permission from this office.

It is most important that you counsel with the Dean prior to _____ returning to school.

Sincerely,

Principal/Designee

School No.	Student No.	Beginning Date of Suspension	Type of Bus (Check One)		No. of Days
			Bus	Regular	

White-Parent; Green-School; Canary-Area; Pink-Guidance; Gold-Security

E. NOTIFICATION OF SUSPENSION

SUSPENSION NOTICE

Date _____

SCHOOL _____

NAME OF STUDENT _____ RACE ____ SEX ____ GRADE_____

PARENT _____PHONE _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SUSPENSION REFERRED BY _____

Has student had prior suspension? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, number of suspension _____

_____

TYPE OF SUSPENSION:

☐ HOME Student may return to school when accompanied by a parent for a conference.

☐ SCHOOL Number of days suspended _____
Student may return on Mo. _____ Day _____ Yr. _____

☐ DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE* Student must report for a disciplinary hearing on _____ at _____
MO. DAY YR. TIME
To be held at _____

SPECIFIC CHARGE AGAINST STUDENT (state in objective terms) _____

_____

_____

_____

*The student must attend this hearing and may be accompanied by the parents. The student may produce witnesses on his/her behalf and may cross examine witnesses appearing against him/her. He/she may be represented by legal counsel at his/her expense.

_____
Principal's Signature

COPIES:
Student – white
Mailed to Parent – canary
Central Office – pink
Principal's Office – goldenrod

For Central Office use only:

Category of Suspension _____

Year _____

Date _____

F. SUSPENSION SUMMARY SHEET

School _____

Month _____ Grade ___

ITEMS	TOTAL	Black		Spanish		Asian		Amer. Indian		White	
		Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
I. Enrollment											
II. Reasons											
1. A. Attendance Class and/or school truancy											
2. B. Aggressive Behavior vs Student Fighting, physical threats against another student											
3. The use of derogatory racial language; race baiting											
4. Feeling girls breast, buttock, or other unacceptable liberties											
5. Trying to kiss Peers w/o consent.											
6. Throwing snowballs at Peers, staff, vehicles, etc.											
7. Aggressive Behavior vs Employee Fighting, physical threats against school employee											
8. Defiance; disrespect of auth.; refusal to obey instructions											
9. Disruption of classes; general misconduct											
10. D. Refusal Not dressing for P.E.											
11. Not serving detentions											
12. Refusing paddling											
13. E. Personal Offenses Unacceptable language, to include gestures											
14. Smoking, or the possession of tobacco											
15. Using alcohol or the possession of											
16. Drug possession, or under the influence											
17. Carrying concealed weapon, or the use of											
18. Forging and/or stealing passes											
19. Forging notes from home											
20. F. Stealing Taking things without permission											
21. G. Other (Explain on reverse side)											
III. Reason Totals											
IV. Multi-reason Suspensions											
V. SUSPENSION TOTAL											
VI. SUSPENSION REPEATERS (See instructions)											
VII. NET SUSPENSIONS (V-VI = VII)											
VIII. % of Suspensions											
IX. Net Drop-Outs											

F. SUSPENSION SUMMARY SHEET

X. SUSPENSIONS – NUMBER OF STUDENTS SUSPENDED (K-8 and 9-12) BY RACIAL/ETHNIC CATEGORY Definition of suspension is an exclusion from education for up to 10 school days (for Chicago, up to 20 school days). Definitions on racial/ethnic categories are given under item E. Do not include "in school" suspensions where regular school work and credits are continued.

		WHITE NON-HISPANIC		BLACK NON-HISPANIC		AMERICAN INDIAN or ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		TOTAL
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1. SUSPENDED ONCE AND ONLY ONCE	K-8											
	9-12											
TOTAL SUSPENDED ONLY ONCE												
2. NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS IN ITEM 1 WHICH LASTED:	1-3 consecutive days											
	4-10 consecutive days											
	11 or more consecutive days											
3. SUSPENDED MORE THAN ONCE	K-8											
	9-12											
TOTAL SUSPENDED MORE THAN ONCE												
4. NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS IN ITEM 3 WHICH LASTED:	1-3 consecutive days											
	4-10 consecutive days											
	11 or more consecutive days											

NUMBER OF TRUANTS AND CHRONIC TRUANTS

1. Truants: Enter an unduplicated count of students, subject to compulsory school attendance, who have been absent without valid cause for 1 to 14 days within any consecutive period of 90 school days ---- _____

2. Chronic Truants: Enter an unduplicated count of students, subject to compulsory school attendance, who have been absent without valid cause for 15 or more days within any consecutive period of 90 school days ---- _____

F. SUSPENSION SUMMARY SHEET (CONTINUED)

133

Example for Item VI:

Pupil "x" receives 10 suspensions
therefore, pupil "x" has 9 repeats
thus, a net suspension of 1 (Because 10-9=1)

Pupils "x" and "y" receive 15 suspensions
therefore, pupils "x" and "y" have 13 suspension repeats
thus, a net suspension of 2 (Because 15-13=2)

TALLY SHEET AND REPORT ON PUPIL SUSPENSION

G. SUSPENSION SUMMARY SHEET

BORO	DISTRICT	LEVEL	SCHOOL

SCHOOL _____ ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NO. _____ BOROUGH _____ ZIP _____

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTING PERIOD _____ 19 THROUGH _____ 19
(SEPT. THROUGH JAN. OR FEB. THROUGH JUNE)

RECORD ALL SUSPENSIONS - BOTH PRINCIPAL'S SUSPENSIONS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S SUSPENSIONS

OFFENSE	GROUP 1		GROUP 2		GROUP 3		GROUP 4		GROUP 5		GROUP 6	
	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN				TOTAL	
							BLACK		WHITE			
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
POSSESSION OF A DANGEROUS WEAPON												
PHYSICAL ASSAULT												
EXTORTION												
MOLESTING												
FIGHTING												
VANDALISM												
THEFT												
DRUGS (SELLING)												
USE AND/OR POSSESSION OF ALCOHOL												
USE AND/OR POSSESSION OF ILLEGAL DRUGS												
FORGERY												
GAMBLING												
IN CLASSROOM DISRUPTION												
OUT OF CLASSROOM DISRUPTION												
CUTTING												
TRUANCY*												
SMOKING*												
POOR ACADEMIC* BEHAVIOR												
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)												
SUB-TOTALS												
TOTALS												

H. HOME VISITATION REPORT

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT – BASIC
Home Visitation Report

STUDENT'S NAME _____ TELEPHONE _____

PARENT'S NAME _____ DATE _____

ADDRESS _____

SCHOOL _____

REASON FOR VISIT: ☐ TARGET PARENT VISIT

☐ TEACHER REFERRAL

TEACHER'S NAME _____

STATE REASON FOR REFERRAL _____

_____

_____

_____

DATE OF VISIT _____

WHAT WAS ACCOMPLISHED BY VISIT? _____

_____

_____

FOLLOW-UP PLANS

_____ 1. REFERRAL TO HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

_____ 2. REFERRAL FOR FOOD STAMPS.

_____ 3. REFERRAL TO FAMILY SERVICES.

_____ 4. REFERRAL TO GUIDANCE COUNSELOR.

_____ 5. DISSEMINATE HEALTH INFORMATION.

_____ 6. PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCE.

_____ 7. OTHER (Specify)

FURTHER FOLLOW-UP IS PLANNED FOR: _____

DATE OF FOLLOW-UP: _____

_____

COMMUNITY RESOURCE PERSON

APPENDIX V

PROGRAM ABSTRACTS AND SELECTED PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS

Page

Program Abstracts

Affective Education Centers 139

Alternative Learning Centers 140

Alternative Resource Centers 141

Center for Human Relations Development 142

Classrooms for Development and Change 143

Conflict Resolution Centers 144

Counseling-Work Center 145

Guidance Services for Drop-out Prevention and In-School Suspension. . 146

Impact. 147

In-School Suspension Program 148

Parents as Teachers 149

Personal Awareness, Careers and Education 150

Reclamation Room Program 151

Student Assistance Centers 152

Time Out Classrooms 153

Program Observations 155

PROJECT: Affective Education Centers

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Affective Education Centers evolved from a program initially funded by a local group and subsequently funded by the district. The basic components of this in-school alternative to suspension are remedial instruction, affective education, teacher training, and parental involvement.

Affective Education Centers provide isolation from peers for a maximum of 15 students. The Centers are classrooms managed by a teacher and instructional aide, both of whom received Teacher Effectiveness Training as well as in-service training in behavior modification, strategies in confrontation techniques, values clarification, reality therapy, and understanding of learning theory.

The program philosophy is non-punitive and the guidelines are flexible. Privileges are limited in the center, and at present there is no restriction on the number of days a student may remain in it. Teachers are committed to prevention and resolution of behavior problems. Students are helped to develop Individualized Educational Plans as a means of teaching them how to accept responsibility for their behavior. To support instructional activities, program staff are provided funds to purchase supplemental materials. Community Resource Persons visit homes and try to bring parents into the school through workshops and evening classes. While resource staff concentrate on students assigned to the centers, they also follow up referrals of students considered potential candidates for suspension. Staff also use the services of community facilities and social services and of alternative education programs.

TARGET GROUP

In this first year, Affective Education Centers serve students in seven of the district's 12 secondary schools. Selected high schools have large numbers of minority students whose rate of suspension exceeded that of non-minority students.

STAFF

The staff includes a Project Manager who commits half of her/his time to this effort, a Coordinating Teacher who works with school principals, and several Community Resource Persons who serve as school liaisons with parents and local agencies. Two Affective Education Coordinators are responsible for preparing training materials and setting up workshops and special courses for district personnel. Each of the seven centers is managed by a teacher and an instructional aide.

PROJECT: Alternative Learning Centers

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Alternative Learning Centers, in-school alternatives to suspension, are managed by one professional staff member. The program, while not punitive, seeks to serve students in a highly structured yet flexible environment. Each center is self-contained and uses all locally available resources.

Certain activities are common to all Alternative Learning Centers; however, specific activities vary, since each school's administration grants the ESAA personnel a degree of autonomy. Each student is given a pre- and post-placement attitude survey. Individual plans are developed to define academic and behavioral needs, and related activities are prescribed. Cognitive needs are met through teacher assistance, though regular classrooms tend to function more as enforced study halls in which regular academic assignments are completed. Affective and social needs are met through individual and group counseling sessions. Commercially developed self-instructional materials dealing with interpersonal relations, self-perception, cultural differences, and values are also used. While parents are informed of the student's placement and needs, they are not involved in the operation of the program.

TARGET GROUP

In this first year, Alternative Learning Centers serve students in seven of the district's 15 junior and senior high schools. Schools were selected on the basis of disproportional minority suspensions and community willingness to participate in the program.

STAFF

The staff includes a program director who performs other administrative duties for the central office, a program supervisor who monitors the program and gives support and assistance to personnel, and seven classroom managers. Each classroom manager has a guidance and counseling degree and has had training in transactional analysis, reality therapy, and contingency management.

PROJECT: Alternative Resource Centers

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Alternative Resource Centers provide non-punitive, in-school alternatives to suspension. Each target school has one classroom, managed by a professional staff member assisted by an aide. Program staff provide a structured environment in which students complete daily academic assignments, receive academic assistance, and participate in group and individual counseling. The program's goal is to improve each student's problem-solving ability. This is achieved by encouraging students to forecast the consequences of their behavior and that of others, to explore alternative behavior and forecast outcomes in hypothetical and real situations, and to develop specific plans which may change students' attitudes and behavior in and out of school. The program emphasizes returning students to their regular classrooms as soon as possible.

TARGET GROUP

In this first year, Alternative Resource Centers serve students in seven of 18 junior and senior high schools. Schools selected had shown an ability to easily adapt new programs to their organizational structure and had disproportional minority representation in students receiving disciplinary punishment.

STAFF

The staff includes a federal programs administrator who monitors and assists the program operation, a program director charged with monitoring staff and individual school activities, program supervisors who facilitate program operation, and one professional and aide who manage the centers. Each staff member has a graduate degree, while aides have obtained at least a bachelor's degree. Various academic disciplines are represented.

PROJECT: Center for Human Relations Development

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Center for Human Relations Development program was designed to involve parents in the schools and to help children understand and cooperate with others. The program consists of four components: staff development and training, parent and community liaison, counseling for elementary students, and human relations counseling for secondary students.

Activities designed to meet the goals of the four components include training workshops for staff and parents, individual and small group counseling for students and staff, class demonstrations, home visits, advisory committee meetings, school open houses, and teacher-parent conferences. Target schools also receive services from a certified counselor and community liaison aide.

The philosophy of the program is non-punitive and is based on the ideal of a child-centered, humanistic model of education. Pre-service and in-service training for school and project staff include experiences based on principles of reality therapy and Teacher Effectiveness Training. All minority students and any students identified by administrators as having disciplinary problems are scheduled for home visits from the community liaison aide. Counselors provide assistance to students with disciplinary problems and demonstrate classroom management strategies to school faculties. Project staff conduct Parent Effectiveness Training workshops promoting parental involvement.

TARGET GROUP

In its first year, the Center for Human Relations Development serves ten of fourteen schools within the district. Students at elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high levels are served by the project. Rates of minority suspension and corporal punishment were the basis for selection of these schools.

STAFF

The staff includes a director, secretary, four elementary school counselors, three secondary school counselors, a community liaison coordinator, and four community liaison aides. Counseling certification is required for the eight professional staff members, and the six paraprofessionals are selected from parents in the community.

PROJECT: Classrooms for Development and Change (CDC)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Classrooms for Development and Change provide an alternative to out-of-school suspension. The structured environment of CDC is one in which students benefit from continuing their regular academic work and receiving counseling designed to identify and resolve underlying problems. Referral to other support staff or social service agencies is provided if deemed necessary by CDC staff.

School administrators generally place students in CDC classrooms for 3 days; however, placement may be for as long as 10 days. Assignment ranges from all day to a portion of the regular school day. When a student returns to school after having been suspended, CDC may be used during a re-entry period. Isolation from peers during placement is a basic element of CDC. Students adhere to specific rules and their privileges are limited while they are assigned to the center.

Parents receive a letter informing them of student assignment and are telephoned by CDC staff.

TARGET GROUP

In the third year of operation, Classrooms for Development and Change serve students attending 16 of the district's 23 secondary schools. Initially, programs were placed in schools with high suspension rates and principals who supported the program.

STAFF

The program is supervised by the district's ESAA administrator. Each center is managed by a professional with teacher certification and a full-time paraprofessional. Staff development has included topics such as cultural awareness, counseling techniques, and reality therapy.

PROJECT: Conflict Resolution Centers (CRC)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Conflict Resolution Centers provide an in-school alternative to suspension. Program components include academic remediation, teacher training, parent training, and extracurricular activities. Students in the centers are isolated from peers. Two Resource Specialists and two aides in each center counsel students and assit them with schoolwork.

The program philosophy is non-punitive and oriented toward values clarification. Students are not necessarily assigned to the CRC for fixed time periods and may visit the centers voluntarily.

In-service teacher training emphasizes the relationship between teacher expectations and student learning. Parent Effectiveness Training is offered to parents and ESAA advisory committee members. The advisory committee is actively involved in the planning and implementation of ESAA activities, especially the extracurricular activities.

TARGET GROUP

In this third year of funding, there is a Conflict Resolution Center in each of the district's five middle schools, which were targeted because of the high rates of suspension and disproportionate numbers of minority students being suspended.

STAFF

At the district level, the ESAA staff includes a coordinator, an evaluator, and a secretary. Each Conflict Resolution Center is staffed by two resource specialists and two aides, who are supported by one ESAA-funded clerk typist.

PROJECT: Counseling-Work Center (CWC)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A Counseling-Work Center (CWC) is a non-punitive classroom alternative to out-of-school suspension. The program may also be used to prepare students for re-entry into classes following suspension, or to prevent suspension when a student's pattern of behavior indicates suspension may be inevitable. CWC staff provide tutoring, counseling, and liaison services between students assigned to the center and other school and community support services.

Administrators assign a maximum of 15 students to the CWC. The structured classroom setting is one in which privileges are limited and decorum is maintained. The program philosophy is non-punitive and the guidelines are precise. Isolated from peers, CWC students complete assignments from their regular teachers, receive counseling, gain experience with problem solving strategies, and make contracts in a structured classroom setting.

The cooperatively developed contract is a basic component of the program. Students, with the assistance of CWC staff, develop a contract directed toward improving the behavior which caused assignment to the center. Until an acceptable and realistic goal is reached, CWC staff negotiate the contract between the pupil and the teacher who made the office referral.

Students are temporarily assigned to Counseling-Work Centers; the length of assignment varies from one class period to several days. Students may enter the center at any time. Parents receive a letter informing them of the student's assignment and are telephoned by CWC staff. Efforts to encourage parental involvement also include conferences, home visits, and written communication.

TARGET GROUP

In this first year, CWCs serve students attending four of the district's 16 secondary schools. Schools selected to participate in the project had high numbers of suspensions, disproportionate numbers of minority suspensions, and administrators who supported the philosophy of the program.

STAFF

The program is directed by the Director of ESAA, who performs other administrative duties. Centers are managed by a teacher with experience or training in counseling and a paraprofessional of a different race. Staff development for administrators and staff has included pre-program planning, reality therapy, on-site visitations, values clarification, counseling activities, and management strategies.

PROJECT: Guidance Services for Drop-Out Prevention and In-School Suspension

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In its first year, the program Guidance Services for Drop-Out Prevention and In-School Suspension was designed to help identify potential drop-outs and support a locally funded in-school suspension program with appropriate guidance services. Components of the program include counseling, human relations activities, and home-school liaison services.

This resource program provides each of the two target schools with a counselor who consults with administrators, faculty, and the guidance department to identify potential drop-outs. Attendance and achievement patterns are closely monitored for target students, home visits are scheduled and extensive counseling is provided. All students referred to administrators for disciplinary problems are identified as target students.

Students assigned to the locally funded in-school suspension program receive group and individual counseling daily for the duration of their assignment. Counselors also sponsor student advisory committees, plan human relations activities for the school, and coordinate community and other school resources.

The program philosophy is non-punitive. Counselors, working with students in the school, home, and community, are committed to helping students remain in school until graduation. Coordination of school and community programs and resources to support student needs is a key element of program operation.

TARGET GROUP

Guidance Services for Drop-Out Prevention and In-School Suspension serves minority students who are potential dropouts. After statistics revealed that drop-out and suspension rates for minority students were excessive in the district, the two largest of the district's five high schools were selected for the ESAA funded guidance and discipline project.

STAFF

Project staff members include a coordinator and two certified counselors. Support staff available to the project include two locally funded in-school suspension coordinators, a vocational education coordinator, and two police-school liaison officers funded by the juvenile justice system in the county.

PROJECT: Impact

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Impact is a guidance-oriented program serving about 120 of the district's students, who have been selected from those referred by parents, teachers, and other staff members. Students are assigned for one period a day in groups of about 12. A guidance counselor directs students in individual and/or small group counseling. Also, students participate in activities concerned with multi-ethnic and interracial understandings, ways to cope with the school environment, and career planning.

A team of educational assistants and family workers pool their expertise, and, by using the services of school personnel and parents, work toward improving school-home communication. Parents are encouraged to establish communication with their children, thus improving the child's self-image and raising the level of academic achievement.

TARGET GROUP

Two junior high schools in the district were selected to participate in project Impact, although minority representation is low, because of the high degree of disproportion in minority suspensions and the number of racial incidents. The program serves students showing hostility and agressive behavior which may lead to suspension, negative attitudes regarding the school, absenteeism and truancy, poor achievement, and a low self-image.

STAFF

An ESAA Program Administrator and several aides, educational assistants, and family workers form teams with the guidance counselors to carry out the Impact program. Teacher training for Impact includes minicourses, workshops, seminars, and on-the-job training. Parents are invited to special workshops.

PROJECT: In-School Suspension Program (ISS)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The In-School Suspension (ISS) program was designed to reduce off-campus suspensions and to decrease the rate of student drop-outs. ISS staff tutor and counsel students. Liaison services between students and other support services in the school and community are provided when deemed appropriate.

Students are temporarily assigned to the structured classroom setting of ISS by the school administrator serving as disciplinarian. Assignment to ISS usually begins on Mondays and lasts for either 5 or 10 days. Placement in ISS is for the total school day.

Isolation from peers is basic to the program's philosophy. Within ISS, additional isolation is insured by assigning students to individual carrels.

ISS staff help students complete work assigned by their regular classroom teachers and provide students with activities designed to help their attitudes and attendance. If necessary, peer tutors and regular classroom teachers will help ISS students. Students complete attitude surveys both before and after they participate in the program. Postage paid opinionnaires are mailed to parents after ISS students are dismissed from the center.

TARGET GROUP

For the last three years, each of the district's two secondary schools has housed an In-School Suspension Center. The program is designed to assist students by providing an alternative to out-of-school suspension and to lower the disproportionate number of minority students who are suspended.

STAFF

The In-School Suspension Program is directed by a central office administrator who also directs other programs. Each center is managed by a teacher with at least three years of experience at the secondary level and, when possible, a degree in guidance and counseling. ISS teachers are assisted by a full-time paraprofessional. Staff development activities have included developing and refining procedures, values clarification, and counseling techniques.

PROJECT: Parents As Teachers (PAT)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Components of the Parents as Teachers program include parent teams who work with students and other parents, human relations training, and staff development activities.

The program philosophy is non-punitive and seeks to develop human relations skills that will help the students cope with conflicts and support student rights and responsibilities. Activities designed to meet project goals and objectives include human relations workshops for school staffs, home visits, parent conferences, school discipline needs assessment, school discipline review committees, and student advisory committee meetings. Parents teach other parents ways to get their children to attend school regularly and to avoid circumstances that may lead to suspension.

Each school in the project is served by a "Parents as Teachers" (PAT) resource team. The team is composed of one minority parent and one non-minority parent. Students with disciplinary problems are referred to the team by administrators and scheduled for home visits and follow up activities. Working with the project coordinator and school administrators, PAT teams assist in the study and analysis of the district and school discipline codes.

TARGET GROUP

Six of the district's fourteen schools have the PAT program for students in grades 4-12. In this first year, the Parents as Teachers program seeks to meet the special problems associated with minority group segregation and discrimination and to help students overcome the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation.

STAFF

Special project staff includes a part-time project director, a special student concerns coordinator, twelve parents as teachers, a project clerk, and outside consultants who conduct in-service training activities. Support services are provided by media staff who produce materials appropriate for community relations and staff development.

PROJECT: Personal Awareness, Careers, and Education (PACE)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Personal Awareness, Careers, and Education Program is designed to reduce suspensions and lower the stress associated with desegregation. PACE teachers operate within the bounds of administrative expectations, needs of their assigned school, and the framework of their particular teaching styles.

Resource services vary, though individual and group counseling of students usually provided. Other services which may be included are tutoring, presenting in-service training for parents and/or teachers, assisting regular staff, organizing school programs and school-community relations activities, and serving as an inter-school/intra-district liaison to provide special assistance to students.

TARGET GROUP

In its second year of funding, PACE serves four of the district's 12 secondary schools and several elementary schools. ESAA schools that have experienced significant changes in their racial populations were selected. The program serves students having problems adjusting to a new school setting.

STAFF

A member of the central office ESAA staff who also performs other administrative duties supervises the program. The PACE staff assigned to each of the target schools consists of one professional with prior teaching experience. PACE teachers work within program guidelines and the expectations of principals. Staff development for PACE staff has consisted of monthly meetings to define the role of PACE teachers and to review counseling strategies.

PROJECT: Reclamation Room Program

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Reclamation Room Program provides an in-school alternative to suspension. Each school has one Reclamation Classroom managed by one staff member. Students are given individual and group counseling, academic assessment, academic assistance and tutoring, career awareness activities, and an opportunity to complete regular classroom assignments.

The program is not intended to be punitive, but some student isolation is used by each school. Reclamation rooms may be isolated from the mainstream of school activities, while other classrooms are located within active school areas. Within Reclamation Rooms, a highly structured environment is insured.

Students are assigned to the Reclamation Room for periods of time commensurate with the gravity of the offense. Successive placements are not unusual.

TARGET GROUP

In this first year, Reclamation Rooms are housed in 10 of 25 junior and senior high schools. Criteria for selecting these schools included evidence of disproportionate disciplinary action against minority students and willingness to adopt the in-school alternative to suspension.

STAFF

An assistant superintendent monitors program operation, while the program director monitors daily activities. Two program supervisors execute designated responsibilities such as home-visit liaison coordination. The activities of the Reclamation Room staff member in each target school are supplemented by eight non-ESAA funded personnel who function as itinerant student/school liaisons.

PROJECT: Student Assistance Centers (SACs)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Student Assistance Centers (SACs) are located in classrooms which are not isolated from the mainstream of activity. Centers are managed by counselors with degrees, and peer counselors trained in crisis intervention. Teachers as well as school disciplinarians may refer students.

The program philosophy is non-punitive and the guidelines are flexible. At present students are not assigned to the SAC for a fixed period of time. Students return to the classroom when the counselor and student agree that the student can acceptably cope with the situation. Peer counseling sessions involve role playing oriented toward conflict resolution and awareness of the feelings of others. Academic remediation and tutoring are provided while students are in the centers.

In addition to SAC programs in the three schools, two Community Tutorial Centers are located in minority neighborhoods. These provide opportunities for minority students, many of whom are bused to school, to receive remedial instruction and serve detentions near their homes. The centers are open two evenings per week.

ESAA also funds positions for four staff members who work in the community, to prevent suspended and expelled students from conflict with law enforcement agencies.

ESAA personnel promote a variety of extracurricular activities aimed at encouraging positive interactions among students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds.

TARGET GROUP

Funded for the first time this year, the program affects each of the district's five high schools. Designed to reduce the disproportionate number of minority students suspended, Student Assistance Centers are currently operative in three schools, and the two Community Tutorial Centers are available to all high school students.

STAFF

The staff includes a full-time District Coordinator, a full-time secretary, a counselor and two paraprofessionals in each of three SACs, two special Deans' Aides in each of the two schools without SACs, and four adults who work in the community with suspended and expelled students.

PROJECT: Time Out Classrooms (TOCs)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Each Time Out Classroom (TOC) isolates assigned students from their peers. The length of assignment, days and periods, is determined by school administrators. Principals may modify the minimal length of assignment established in program guidelines; however, the maximum time for assignment to TOC, without prior consultation with the program coordinator, is ten consecutive school days per referral. Students may be referred for placement by school staff, aides, and parents or guardians; students may even refer themselves for a period or two during a day.

One teacher and one aide supervise activities in TOCs. Activities include academic assistance, counseling, and group reinforcement activities. The number of students assigned to the TOC is kept low to allow one-to-one relationships between staff and student.

Many of the regular teaching staff members have participated in classroom management workshops covering such topics as behavior modification, transactional analysis, Teacher Effectiveness Training, self-enhancing education, and home visitation techniques.

TARGET GROUP

Each of the three middle and high schools in the district have Time Out Classrooms. Time Out Classrooms provide a temporary alternative educational environment for students with behavioral problems and for students who need academic assistance because of excessive absences.

STAFF

The professional staff includes a Director of Federal Programs, six full-time teachers, and six part-time aides. In-service training has been provided for both administrators and teachers.

Observation 1

Every possible provision is made to help students keep up with their work; within the center, student activities include research in a designated area using reference books of varying reading levels, science experiments, water colors and drawing for art class, and using reading lab tapes. "We can modify almost any assignment except cooking." If necessary, a child's teacher may come to the center during planning periods to assist the student.

On the morning they enter the center, students collect all books and supplies from their lockers. After hearing the rules, students begin regular classwork. The counselor then obtains anecdotal data from students who complete the Attitude Survey and Behavior Analysis, the basis for initial counseling. Group counseling sessions for values clarification and self-concept are conducted a minimum of twice a week. "Work and discipline are first in this school and the other," therefore, tutoring "cuts time for discussion." The isolation from peers and the structured environment of the center are believed to be the only punitive aspects of the center. Some students, though they do not admit it to peers, prefer the center to attending classes because it is "quiet, calm," and students are "not yelled at": "Sometimes they're only passing when they are in here."

Observation 2

The center, located near classrooms, is somewhat smaller than a classroom and is furnished with tables, chairs and filing cabinets. The coordinator expressed the need for an additional room. The room presently serves as office space for the center staff, as well as a counseling and tutoring center for students.

The coordinator emphatically opposes the idea that the center is an in-school suspension center, since he views in-school suspension as punitive. The purpose of the center is to provide crisis intervention and help students in dealing with problems; it is not punishment. The use of peer counselors is in keeping with this philosophy, as is the procedure which seeks to return students to class as soon as they are able to deal with their problem rather than having students serve specified "sentences." The coordinator believes that peer counselors are more successful than adults in achieving the goals of this center.

The coordinator conducted a survey of the school's staff at the end of the first semester after the center began operation. The results of the study show teachers rating the quality of services from "poor" (one response) to "excellent" (five responses), with the majority rating it either "good" or "very good" (twenty responses). Comments ranged from enthusiasm to complete ignorance of the center. The more negative comments tended to indicate a lack of any permanent change in the behavior of students who have been to the center and a shortage of information about how personnel dealt with students.

Observation 3

At the beginning of the year, acceptance of the project and the team was minimal. Students suspected the team of being police-related personnel, and faculty members were suspicious of their title and their opportunity to "spy on" or evaluate teachers. By the time of the site visit, the faculty was no longer threatened by the presence or functions of the project staff, and one teacher had invited program members to observe a class period. Students had begun to confide problems to team members, and administrators spoke of the positive effects of home visits by non-school personnel.

Observation 4

The student is assigned to a "facilitator," either an adult aide or a peer counselor, upon arriving at the Center. The operation of the center is explained to students and when students are emotionally ready, the facilitator and student explore the incident which led to the referral.

Alternative ways of dealing with the situation are discussed and role playing is used. When alternative possibilities have been explored, the student and facilitator discuss the appropriateness of each alternative. The student and facilitator then discuss the student's return to the classroom. Role playing is again used to help prepare the student for different situations which may be encountered upon returning to the class. When the student returns to class, s/he discusses the incident with the referring teacher. The need to make up missed work is also discussed.

Observation 5

The large room, formerly an art room, is arranged with tables for art projects and centers for various types of activities. The relaxed atmosphere of the room, enhanced by soft background music, is the setting in which the teacher works to help students solve problems and make social adjustments. The philosophy that "We'll do anything to reach a child" does not interfere with the student's being informed about why s/he was referred and how.

Observation 6

The center is located in a long, narrow room on a main hallway. There are no windows in the room, although there is a glass panel in the door. There are a few pictures and the general impression is one of barrenness. A visit during a group counseling session included an observation of students discussing the center. Some of the student comments were:

"I think it's a good idea, and I won't come back."

"The best thing is I get class credit, and I don't have homework."

"I'd rather be sent home; at least I could watch TV."

"I feel embarassed when my friends see me being walked to lunch and to the bathroom."

The last comment evoked a heated discussion. Among those students observed, the loss of bathroom privileges seemed to be least understood and most resented.

Observation 7

The counselor was observed conducting a group counseling activity with eleven students, seventy percent of whom were minorities. The session, designed for students in danger of failing two or more subjects, included students who were referred for this session by the principal. During the session, the counselor sought to elicit student goals and plans for achieving goals and overcoming their problems. The counselor conducted the session informally, supported the students, and seemed to have open communication with the students (i.e., students readily related their problems such as "drug use" and "fresh mouth"). All students were invited to make individual appointments with the counselor, and three did immediately.

Observation 8

The teacher has contacted the parents of students unfamiliar with their new surroundings, students traveling away from their neighborhood to attend this school under the Open Enrollment plan. "Drop-in" periods have been established so that students who "need someone to talk with" can visit the project room; this is viewed as having diffused some possible "explosions" because minority students know that the teacher cares and they have had a chance to "let it off."

Observation 9

The response of this school's administrators to the center was uniformly positive. The principal expressed the belief that the district may attempt to fund the centers locally if ESAA funds should be withdrawn, since the positive feedback about the centers was so strong. The school disciplinarian characterized the center as "extremely effective" and pointed out that the number of suspensions had dropped sharply since its establishment. She commented further that "it took us a while to learn how to use it." She attributes the success of the center to the individual attention students receive and regards the removal of problem students from their reinforcing peer groups as an important function of the center. Administrators expressed concern that although the overall number of suspensions is down, the proportion of minority students among those suspended remains high.

Observation 10

The structured environment is coordinated through the teamwork of the teacher and aide co-workers. A resource area for reference materials, a typewriter, and student desks are provided. Other than the low-playing radio which provides "musical therapy" and "drowns external noise," there is quiet. The teacher begins counseling by asking students if "I can help you in getting your work done." Eventually, problems surface: home problems, concerns about pregnancy, abortion, food, clothes, or mental health needs. When pertinent, resource help is arranged. As students complete work for their courses, work schedules are checked off. Since there is no free time during the day, students "get so much work done that they feel good."

Observation 11

The counselor has no specific program guidelines but is required to be involved in all professional staff activities and was directed to cooperatively develop referral procedures with the administration and faculty. She has been involved in individual counseling activities with students referred by teachers and administrators, small group counseling with students to support behavior changes, and on-going activities with classes, using motivational and self-image materials. In addition, she confers with teachers at their request. She has used a sequentially planned program with five classrooms this year. She keeps a quarterly log of all contacts and keeps an index card file of student contacts for the principals, though she does not collect or report disciplinary statistics.

A classroom presentation was observed. The class was a physical education/health group of forty-one girls, sixty percent of whom were minority. Self-image and personality manifestations were the topics discussed. Cassette tapes, class discussion, and written hand-outs were used during the sessions. The regular teacher remained with the class and checked papers during the counselor's presentation.

Observation 12

In addition to completing work, students participate in individual and group counseling sessions, which are scheduled on a regular basis. Daily, the full-day class members discuss general problems; topics are chosen either by the teacher or by the students. Topics have included "getting along with teachers and students," "when and how to walk out of a fight," and "why older people think differently than you." The group interaction is monitored by center staff who encourage students to assume leadership roles. "I want each kid to take a turn at being in charge. They get an idea how difficult it is to control [undesirable] behavior." The teacher making this statement continued, "Just letting these kids know that someone does care about what they feel and think is of benefit. They get a lot off their chests when asked the right questions. Somehow, no one ever asked the right questions."

Individual counseling is managed in much the same way, however, the topics chosen for discussion are dictated by the student's offense. When asked how one "gets through" to six-foot-four-inch, two-hundred fifty-pound students, one teacher replied, "They may be big, but they're still kids. Face it, you get them to trust you ... after all you're on their side ... and the rest comes easy. These kids don't try to be bad. It's just that they haven't been shown other ways to behave or to think, for that matter."

Observation 13

The counselor follows no formal guidelines or procedures for the project. The principal and counselor worked closely to establish the direction and plan for the project. As a part of this plan, pupils targeted from each class by the teachers and principal participate in weekly individual or small group sessions with the counselor. In addition, all fourth graders in class groups work with the counselor on a project to develop rules for the classroom and the school. Planned staff development activities with the total faculty have included a school-wide "no licks campaign" with suggested alternative classroom management techniques. Other projects initiated this year have included a nine-week program for kindergarten parents using reality therapy techiques, a citizenship project for fifth graders to develop a code of conduct for the school, a school-wide attendance improvement project, a responsibility training project for selected groups, and a stress reduction workshop for teachers in the district.

A small group session of six third-grade children working on the personal commitment project was observed. The group, 50 percent minority and 50 percent non-minority, participated in a "magic circle" discussion of the progress of the project. The children appeared to be enthusiastic, open and verbal when communicating, and pleased with the effects of their work. Two of them stated, "My grades are much better."

The feedback about the project from the staff has been excellent. The faculty has requested a workshop next year based on principles of reality therapy, and teachers have begun to request help informally and through classroom demonstrations. The corporal punishment rate for the first three quarters of the year has been reduced from 60 percent for minority boys to 37 percent, and from 21 percent for minority girls to 13 percent.